

AUG 25 1923

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

VOL. XLIV, 3

WHOLE No. 175

THE
AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

EDITED BY

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COÖPERATION OF

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, HERMANN COLLITZ, TENNEY FRANK,
WILFRED P. MUSTARD, D. M. ROBINSON

JULY, AUGUST, SEPTEMBER
1923

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1919.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I.—The Art of Stealing in Hindu Fiction. Part II. By MAURICE BLOOMFIELD,	193
II.—Ibidulus and Gvif. Part II. By ROBERT S. RADFORD,	230
III.—Es and Nos. By W. H. KIEK,	260
IV.—The Date of Plautus's <i>Luce</i> . By W. A. OLDFATHER,	275
REVIEWS:	277
Neue Jahrbücher für das klass. Altertum, Vol. XXV (1922), Heft 3-10.— <i>Romana</i> , Vol. XLVIII (1922), Nos 1 et 2.	
RECENT:	285
Reprints (Fyrmur H. H. H. H.)—MOSVIE's Die Ältesten litauischen Sprachdenkmäler (Harold H. Bender).—W. HERRMAN and H. MOSE's Sammlung vulgärlateinischer Texte, Heft 6 (C. U. Clark).—SCHIAFFARELLI's Auxilia ad res Italicas Medii Aevi exquirendas (C. U. Clark).—W. M. LINDHART's Palaeographia Latina, Part I (C. U. Clark).	
BOOKS RECEIVED:	290

The *American Journal of Philology* is open to original communications in all departments of philology—classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$1.50 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage, 50 cents, extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the Editor, Professor U. W. E. Miller, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Subscriptions, remittances and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLIV, 3

WHOLE No. 175

I.—THE ART OF STEALING IN HINDU FICTION.

PART II.

Thieves' 'understanding' with the Law—Harūn-ar-Rashīd—Fagin—Rhampsinitus—Gold-brick—'It takes a thief to catch a thief'—Thieves' wisdom—The acme of the art—Noble thief—Thieves' conversion—Romance—Defense—Retribution.

THIEVES' 'UNDERSTANDING' WITH THE LAW.

Hot-footed, the minions of the law: bailiffs, beadles, soldiers, guards, and king's men, are on the trail of the culprit. *Manu* 9. 264, 265 enumerates the places where thieves lurk; some of them occur in our stories: Assembly-houses, houses where water is distributed or cakes are sold, brothels, taverns, and victualers' shops, cross-roads, well-known trees, festive assemblies, play-houses and concert-rooms, old gardens, forests, shops of artisans, empty dwellings, and natural or artificial groves. Occasionally there is an 'understanding' between the Law and the criminal, mostly sinister in character, which calls up painful Western experiences: 'There is no remedy against a thief who is under protection, any more than against a liar,' says the *Subhāṣitārṇava* 286 (*Böhtlingk, Indische Sprüche*, 4063, 5771). In *Rāuhineya Caritra* 17 King Crenika himself enters into a pact with the thief Lohakhura to furnish him with provisions (*grāsa*), on the condition that he stop pillaging the king's city, *Rājagṛha*. In *Kharassara Jātaka* (79) a minister ingratiates himself with the king, and, after collecting the royal revenue in a border-village, privily arranges with a band of robbers, that he will march his men off into the jungle, leaving the village for the

rascals to plunder,—on condition that they give him half the booty. In Rāuhineya Caritra 221 the chief of the palace guard accuses the minister Abhaya of taking 'graft' from the thief Rāuhineya. J. J. Meyer, in his Translation of Daçakumāracarita, pp. 21, 34, quotes very pertinently V. A. Smith's note to Sleeman's Rambles, vol. i, p. 178, to wit: 'The barbarous habit of alliance with robber-gangs is by no means confined to Rajput nobles and householders. Men of all creeds and castes yield to the temptation, and magistrates are sometimes startled to find that Honorary Magistrates, Members of District Boards, and others of apparently the highest respectability, are the abettors and secret organizers of robber bands.'

HARŪN-AR-RASHĪD.

Countless injunctions upon the king to protect his land and people from thieves and robbers pervade the literature; see, e. g., Kāuṭilya's Arthaśāstra 4. 6, 'The king should protect his subjects against the rascalities of thieves, robbers, cheats, and other rogues' (Pañcatantra i, verse 343, Hitopadeça, 2. 105). As a rule, it takes a thief to catch a thief. But thieves, for the most part, are true to their guild, and ply their trade secretly and unnotoriously. At this point the theme interlaces with another romantic theme, dear to our hearts, namely that of Harūn-ar-Rashīd. When the king's bailiffs, who for the purpose of the story are stupid, fail to relieve the city, harried by a clever thief, the king himself, or his minister, or a prince, or some other hero goes out to catch him. In the course of their adventures we obtain some idea as to how the loot is carried off and secured. This includes a glimpse of the thief's lair, mostly hidden, or even subterranean, where we see him surrounded by his loot, so precarious in the getting. The setting is sombre, sometimes lit up by flashes of brilliance; it calls to mind the robbers' caves and thieves' inns of Western story. And, just as in these, the eternal feminine occasionally steps on the boards to throw over it the glamor of romance.

In Siṅhāsanadvātrīṅikā King Vikrama often starts out by himself to scan the circle of the earth, filled with wonderful things; see, e. g., Indische Studien xv. 344, 354, 357, 381, 393, 417, 421; cf. Hemavijaya, Kathāratnākara, story 164 (Hertel,

vol. ii, p. 138); story 178 (ib. p. 170). His great rival in the world of fiction, Bhojarāja has the same engaging habit; see Bhojaprabandha (ed. Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara) pp. 28, 52, 70, 77, 81, 90, 92, etc.; Prabandhacintāmaṇi, pp. 42, 43, 71, 112, etc. King Kanakaratha does the same in Kathākoṣa p. 184. The adventures of the Pañcadanḍachattraprabandha begin with King Vikrama's starting out by night as Harūn-ar-Rashīd. Similarly King Uditodaya and his minister Subuddhi wander thru the city at night to catch thieves: Samyaktvakāumudī (see below, p. 221).

In the Vetālapañcaviṅcati (Stories of the Vampire), Īva-dasa nr. 13; Kathāsaritsāgara 88 (Vetāla 14); Hindī Baitāl Pa-chīsī (Oesterley, p. 102); Tamil Vedāla Cadai nr. 17 (Babington, p. 71) this motif appears as part of a story which might easily be dressed out as a real novel, or even swiftly moving drama. What concerns us here is as follows: In the city of Ayodhyā lives a mighty King Vīraketu, defender of the earth, as a rampart defends a city. At a certain time the citizens are continuously being plundered, so they assemble together, and make complaint to the king. When the king has received their petition, he stations watchmen in plain clothes all around the city, in order to discover the thieves.

But they can not find them out; the city goes on being robbed. So, one night, the king himself goes out to watch, and, as he is roaming about armed, he observes a person dexterously moving along the rampart, his footfall noiseless, looking behind him with rolling eyes. Seeing the king he says to him, 'Who are you?' The king answers, 'I am a thief.' On the thief's invitation they go together to the thief's dwelling in an underground cavern in the forest. It is luxuriously, nay magnificently furnished, illuminated by blazing lamps, looking like a second Pātāla not governed by Bali.¹ As the robber goes to an inner room, a female slave comes and says to the king: 'Noble Sir, how come you to enter this mouth of death? This man is a notorious thief; he will do you some harm. I assure you he is treacherous; leave the house at once!' The king does so, goes to his palace, but returns with his forces that very night.

¹ Bali is king of the serpents in Pātāla, the nether world.

And when his army is ready for battle, he blockades the entrance to the robber's cave with his troops, who sound all their martial instruments. Then the brave robber, knowing that his secret has been discovered, rushes out to fight, determined to die. He displays superhuman prowess in battle. Alone, armed with sword and shield, he cuts off the trunks of elephants, slashes off the legs of horses, and lops off the heads of soldiers. But the king, skilful swordsman, by a dexterous trick of fence, forces his sword from his hand, and then the dagger which he draws. As he is now disarmed the king throws away his own weapon, grapples with the thief, flings him to the earth, and captures him alive. And he takes him back as prisoner, with all his wealth, and gives orders that he shall be impaled next morning. The romantic conclusion below (p. 222).

The story just sketched is the typical Harūn and thief motif. We shall see later on that it properly joins itself to another congenial theme, namely, maiden falling in love with condemned thief, but, for the present, we may scan the rather cameo-like picture a while longer. In Kathās. 112. 147 ff. the present story recurs with some descriptive changes, but Devendra's Prākṛit story of the thief Maṇḍiya² contains additional touches that are characteristic and suggestive. The resourceful thief-catching Harūn is here no less than Mūladeva, himself master-thief, and, as we have seen, author of a treatise on stealing. But in the course of his adventures he has become king of Beṇṇāyaḍa, and has assumed the traditional and legendary name of Vikramarāja, terror of evil-doers whenever he shows himself. As such he must uphold the laws, as witness:

In Beṇṇāyaḍa lived a beggar, named Maṇḍiya, bent upon stealing the goods of others. He spread the report among people that he was suffering from loathsome sores, and kept his knees smeared with ointment, and swathed in bandages, and hobbled along, as tho with difficulty, supporting his feet with a staff. By day he begged, by night he dug breaches into houses, stole much property, and deposited it in a cave in the environs of the town. There also lived his sister. In the middle of the cave there was a well. For pay, the thief used to entice people to carry his loot to his cave. There his sister would pretend to

² Jacobi's *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī*, pp. 65 ff.

wash their feet on a previously prepared seat next to the well, and then push them into the well, where they perished.

Thus Maṇḍiya kept up his depredations, the bailiffs being unable to catch him. The citizens' complaints reached Mūladeva's ears, so that he appointed a new chief of the guard, but he also could not catch the thief. Then Mūladeva himself, clad in a dark robe, went out by night and sat down near a certain gambling hall. Maṇḍiya came along, and asked 'Who sits here?' Mūladeva answered, 'I am a beggar.' Maṇḍiya said: 'Come, I'll make a man of you!' Mūladeva got up. The thief dug a breach into the house of a rich man, and took out great treasures, which he loaded upon Mūladeva. They proceeded outside the city, Mūladeva in front, the thief with drawn sword behind.

When they had arrived at the cave, Maṇḍiya began to bury the treasure. To his sister he said, 'Wash the feet of this guest.' She bade him sit down at the brink of the well, and took hold of his foot, under pretence of washing it. Observing its delicacy, she guessed that he was a person of quality, and pity sprung up in her heart. She made a signal on the flat of his foot, 'Flee, lest you die!' So he did, and she cried after him, 'He has fled, he has fled!' Maṇḍiya drew his sword, and pursued the king on the highway. When Mūladeva perceived that Maṇḍiya was close upon him, he hid behind a Īiva phallus on the square. The thief mistook it for the figure of a man, cleft it, and returned to his underground dwelling. In the morning he begged in the market-place. Thence the king had him brought to his presence, treated him courteously, and asked his sister for wife. Maṇḍiya gave her to the king with a dowry. After a time the king told Maṇḍiya that he needed money. Maṇḍiya procured it, and was honored by the king. The king kept asking for more, until he learned from the sister (his wife) that Maṇḍiya had no more. The king returned the goods to their rightful owners, and ordered Maṇḍiya to be impaled upon a stake.

In Naṭeśa Sāstrī's *Folklore in Southern India*, pp. 53 ff., this story appears as part of the long chain of Prince Sundara's adventures. In it a robber (a sort of Raffles) picks out as his aid Prince Sundara, who is hiding from pursuit in an alms-

house. This time it is the robber's daughter who saves the hero's life and ultimately becomes Sundara's queen. In Hemavijaya, story 178 (Hertel, vol. ii, p. 170) King Vikrama catches four thieves possessed of magic powers, but releases them when he verifies their skill and their truthfulness. And Devendra³ has two very interesting Prākṛit stories in which the same Harūn novelette is interlaced with other events. In both of these the hero is one Agaladatta (Agaḍadatta) who offers to catch the thief whom no one else can catch. In the houses of courtezans, in taprooms, in gambling places, and in the stalls of bakers; in the sheds of the parks where one gets water to drink; in the huts of ascetics, in empty temples, on the squares, in bazaars and markets Agaladatta fearlessly stalks his prey.⁴ Under a mango tree he presently observes a religious mendicant with firm calves and long legs, whom he suspects. The mendicant says to him, 'From whence and why do you roam about?' 'Reverend Sir, I wandered out of Ujjenī, as my property is wasted away.' The mendicant engages Agaladatta, makes a breach in shape of a sirivaccho⁵ into a rich man's house, and brings out baskets full of valuables. He picks up yet other helpers to carry the loot which they take to a dilapidated park. Here they all lie down to sleep, but Agaladatta softly slips off, and hides behind a tree. The mendicant gets up, kills the other carriers, but, not seeing Agaladatta on his bed of leaves, starts to search for him. Agaladatta smites him with his sword, and wounds him to death. The mendicant tells him to take his sword, and to knock at the wall of Santijjā's temple, back of the cemetery. There lives the mendicant's sister in a cave; she will become Agaladatta's wife, and he will become lord of all the riches there. He does so, shows the woman the mendicant's sword, she receives him, prepares carefully a couch for him, and bids him rest there. But, when she does not watch, he slips away from the couch, and hides himself. A huge stone which she has made ready falls upon the bed and smashes it, whereupon she exclaims gleefully, 'Ah, I have killed the slayer of my brother!' Agaladatta rushes from his hiding place, seizes her

³ See Jacobi, *Ausgewählte Erzählungen*, pp. 66 ff.

⁴ See Manu's catalog of thieves' lurking places, above, p. 193.

⁵ See above, p. 115.

by the hair, and says, 'Ah, daughter of a slave wench, who could kill me?' She falls at his feet, he forgives her, and takes her with him. The king hears his story, honors him, and gives him his own daughter, the princess Kamalasenā, for wife.

In a story or two the Harūn motif as regards thieves runs to seed. Thus Dhammapada Commentary 2.3° the King of Benares goes about the streets in disguise, eaves-dropping, to ascertain the candid opinion of his subjects as to his character. The first house he comes to is that of the young man who has received from his teacher on graduation a charm: 'You are rubbing, you are rubbing! Why are you rubbing? I know too.' The king observes that some tunnel thieves are in the act of breaking into the house. The noise awakens the young man, who begins to repeat his charm, and the thieves flee. Afterwards the king learns the charm from the young man, and saves his own life by reciting it when a treacherous barber, conspiring with the king's ministers, is about to cut his throat.⁶

In Kathās. 71.22 ff., prince Mṛgāṅkadatta, guest of Māyāvaṭu, a Bhilla (robber) king, whose life he has once saved, goes by night in search of adventures. He is himself fitted out in the accoutrements of a thief. A man jostles against him in the darkness, and strikes his shoulder against him. The prince rushes at him angrily, and challenges him to fight. But the man tells him to blame the moon for not lighting up this night. He explains that he is a thief, whereupon Mṛgāṅkadatta says trickily: 'Give me your hand; you are of my profession.' They form an alliance, and reach an old well covered with grass. There the man enters a tunnel which takes them to the harem of Māyāvaṭu, the Bhilla king. By lamplight the prince recognizes his companion as Caṇḍaketu, the warder of Māyāvaṭu. Caṇḍaketu is the secret paramour of the king's wife. Her suspicions turn Caṇḍaketu against the prince whom he has not recognized. In the final dénouement the prince helps his host discover his wife's faithlessness, and punish the treacherous warder.

There is also a touch of the Harūn motif in the story, 'The Affectionate Prince,' Parker, Village Folk-Tales of Ceylon, vol.

⁶ See the author in A. J. P. XL. 30, for other versions of the 'rubbing charm,' together with rather remote parallels to that story.

iii, pp. 293 ff. A prince who is roaming in the company of his younger sister, cleans up a nest of thieves in behalf of a king, killing all but one of the band whom he merely wounds. When the prince goes out to hunt, and leaves his sister in the thieves' house, the thief proposes to the princess that they should kill the prince, and then marry. They plot to send him for a lotus flower in a crocodile pond which is to cure the princess who feigns sickness. The prince, tho swallowed by the crocodile, is saved by the divinity of the pool, and returns with the lotus. They next plot that the thief shall cut off the head of the prince from the outside of a screen within which the prince is washing his face. But the prince happens to come outside the screen, discovers the thief, and kills both.⁷

In one instance Hemavijaya, story 82 (Hertel, vol. i, pp. 233 ff.), a shrewd minister saves a king the trouble of ferreting out a clever and resourceful thief by sheer intellect. Cillaṇā, King Çreṇika's queen, has a wonderful garden. In it grows a mango-tree from which the thief steals fruit by magically making the tree bend towards him, in order to satisfy a pregnancy whim⁸ of his wife. Cillaṇā, in grief, tells the king,⁹ who, in turn, consults his minister Abhaya. Abhaya promises to deliver the thief into his hands. One night, a company of gamblers, adulterers, thieves, and meat-eaters arrange a concert which Abhaya attends, and enlivens by telling a story: An old spinster, longing for a husband, steals flowers from a garden, wherewith to worship the God of Love. She is caught in the act by the gardener who bids her do his will for ransom. She agrees to come to him after her wedding. After she has succeeded in obtaining a husband, she starts, arrayed in her best, to fulfil her contract, but is successively held up by robbers, who crave her jewels, and by a hungry Rākṣasa (ogre), both of whom she tells of her engagement with the gardener. She promises to return after she has been with the gardener. When she comes to each

⁷ Cf. the Lithuanian pasaka, Apš razbaininkus, in Schleicher's *Litauisches Lesebuch*, pp. 163 ff., and Wiedemann's *Handbuch der Litauischen Sprache*, pp. 219 ff.

⁸ See the author, *JAOS*. vol. XL, pp. 1 ff.

⁹ The same lady figures in a different story in *Çālibhadra Carita* 2. 31, as Cellaṇā, queen of the same Çreṇika.

in turn, they are so much struck with her honesty that they allow her to return unharmed to her husband. At the end of the story Abhaya asks the present company which of the four: husband, gardener, robbers or Rākṣasa, had performed the most difficult act of renunciation. When the turn of the thief of the mango comes, he votes for the robbers who did not steal her jewels. Thus Abhaya knows him to be the thief, and delivers him to the king.¹⁰

The familiarity of the Harūn-ar-Rashīd idea is perhaps brought out best by what looks uncommonly like a travesty on the same. In Parker's *Village Folk-Tales of Ceylon*, vol. iii, pp. 346 ff., a thief, Mātalānā, by name, son of the king by a concubine, begins to steal things belonging to that king. Tho his guards are unable to catch the thief, the king gives orders to a carpenter to make a pair of stocks intended for the thief. Mātalānā, coming along, asks the carpenter the purpose of the stocks, and when he is told, asks to be shown how it is done.¹¹ He shows how, the thief locks the carpenter into the stocks, and spices his confinement with blows and jeers.

Mātalānā next steals the king's clothes, while they are being washed. One night he goes to the pool, and takes part in the washing. The washerman informs the king who comes there with his army. Mātalānā throws a pot into the river, and begins to cry out, 'Your Majesty, look there! the thief sank under the water.' The king takes off his clothes, and descends into the pool. Mātalānā, in the dark, puts on his clothes, mounts the king's horse, and gives orders to seize the king and tie him to his own horse which the thief is riding. Then Mātalānā makes his escape.

Once more, Mātalānā steals the king's clothes from his washerman by what may be called the 'cake trick.'¹² Preparing tasty cakes, he hangs them on trees in the jungle, near where the washerman is washing. With two or three cakes in his hand,

¹⁰ Cf. the nearly identical story, below, p. 218, and for exotic parallels, Köhler, *Kleinere Schriften*, vol. I, pp. 214 ff.

¹¹ Important trick-motif, to be treated elsewhere; e. g., *Pañcatantra* (Southern Textus Simplicior: ZDMG. LXI. 32, 42); *Kathāsaritsāgara* i. 349; 13. 91; *Vetālapañcaviṃśati* 24. Cf. Benfey, *Pañcatantra* i. 609.

¹² See Parker, *ibidem*, ii. 451^a; iii. 167.

and munching another, he asks the washerman for some water. The washerman asks, 'What is that you are eating?' The thief replies, 'Why, friend, haven't you eaten the Kaepṭiyā¹³ cakes on the trees near here?' The thief gives him one to taste, the washerman runs off to pluck some more from the trees, and Mātālānā goes off with the king's clothes.

The king proclaims by beat of drum that he will give as much wealth as a tusk elephant can carry, as well as a share of his kingdom to any one who will catch Mātālānā. The latter himself touches the drum, and promises in three months' time to deliver over Mātālānā in the courtesan's house. He is brought before the king who treats him like a friend during the three months. At the end of that time the king happens to go to the courtesan's house; whereupon Mātālānā reports to the king's ministers that he is ready to deliver up the thief. They surround the courtesan's house, seize the king who is ashamed to speak, beat him, and put him in the stocks. Mātālānā escapes for good.

FAGIN.¹⁴

All over the world the qualities of cunning and resourcefulness stand, as it were, in the centre of thieves' lore, and with it the note of humor is struck quite as universally. Thieves perform tricks upon outsiders first of all, but scarcely less upon one another. This begins with the boy thief. There is not in India that high school of thievery, presided over by the late Mr. Fagin, but the idea of the boy thief whose cleverness draws the grudging admiration of the master-thief, is by no means wanting. From such a sphere comes the delicious incident in the story of Mūladeva in Kathās. 124, in which that arch-roguer's own son steals his bedstead from under him, letting him down gently on a heap of cotton while he remains asleep.¹⁵ A folklore version of this Fagin trick shows us a prince trained so nicely that he

¹³ A small jungle tree on which lac is formed.

¹⁴ Cf. Köhler, *Kleinere Schriften zur Märchenkunde*, vol. I, p. 210.

¹⁵ See last, the author in *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, LII. 624 ff. This story, or this particular prank, is echoed in folk-lore; see Knowles, *Folk-Tales of Kashmir*, p. 104; Stokes, *Indian Fairy Tales*, p. 216; Parker, *Village Folk-Tales of Ceylon*, ii. 81 ff.; Nāṭeśa Sāstrī, *Story of Madana Kāma Rāja*, p. 246.

can steal a crow's egg without the crow flying off, and then restore it in the same way; see Parker, l. c. ii, pp. 35, 38, 41; Knowles, l. c., p. 110. Parker, vol. iii, p. 41, reports, with remarkable approach to Faginism, the trick of a young hopeful of a thief, who steals two tinkling little bells from his father's feet, an act which gives uncommon satisfaction to the father, a seasoned practitioner.

In Ralston, *Tibetan Tales*, pp. 37 ff., a woman apprentices her son to a weaver; the boy being sharp and quick, soon learns the trade. As the weaver wears fine clothes, takes good baths, and partakes of dainty food, the boy becomes suspicious, and quizzes the weaver who says to him, 'Nefew, I carry on two kinds of work. By day I practice weaving, but by night thieving.' The boy says, 'If that be so, Uncle, I too will practice thieving.' The weaver decides to test him, so he buys a hare in the market, and gives it to him to roast. The youth does so, and eats up one of its legs. When the weaver receives his roasted hare and sees only three legs, he says: 'Nefew, where is the fourth leg gone?' The boy replies: 'Uncle, it is true that hares have four legs, but if the fourth leg is not here, it cannot have gone anywhere.' The weaver concludes that, tho he has long been a thief, the lad is a still greater thief. And he goes with the boy and the three-legged hare into a drinking-shop and calls for liquor. When they have both drunk, the weaver says, 'Nefew, the score must be paid by a trick.' 'Uncle, he who has drunk may play a trick; why should I, who have not drunk, do this thing?' The weaver sees that the lad is a great swindler, so he determines to carry out a theft with him; in this we shall, later on (p. 207), find that what desireth to become a hook crooks early.

A pretty close approach to a Fagin story is found in the folklore collection of Day, *Folk-Tales of Bengal*, pp. 171 ff.: Two thieves have a son each, whom they resolve to train in their profession. In the village there is a celebrated Professor of the 'Science of Roguery' (obviously *Steṇaśāstra*), with whom they place their boys. The elder thief's boy distinguishes himself so much that the Professor tries him with the following Fagin test: Upon the thatch of a dilapidated hut, so rickety that even a mouse climbing up on it would shake down bits of straw and

earth, there is a splendid gourd which the couple living inside are watching by day and by night. The boy, with a string, a cat, and a knife, gently climbs the roof. When the woman wakes up he squeezes the throat of the cat, so that it mews. This averts suspicion. He cuts off the gourd, ties his string to it, and throws the cat violently upon the ground. During the hubbub created by the clamor of the cat and the loud talk of the couple, he brings down the gourd, and thus extracts from the Professor the testimonial, 'The worthy son of a worthy father!'

His next, more pretentious stunt is to steal the gold chain of the queen from her neck. Dressed in dark clothes, he takes with him a sword, a hammer, and some large nails. Before the zenana can be got at, four doors, including the Lion gate, must be passed; each of these has a guard of stalwart men. The guards are relieved every hour, so that, once every hour, at each door there are 36 men present. At that particular moment the thief enters each of the four gates, passing the hour preceding the next relief in the garden between each two doors. Finally the lighted queen's chamber stares him in the face. At the end of every hour a Chinese gong is struck, whose sound is so strong that nearly a minute must elapse after the first stroke, before the second stroke can be sounded. In each of these minutes he drives a nail into the wall. By twelve o'clock he is in the loft of the chamber. A servant-maid is drowsily reciting a story, the royal pair apparently asleep. He cuts off the head of the maid, himself going on for some time reading. Then he strips the murdered woman of her clothes, puts them on, takes the chain from the neck of the queen, and escapes.

The king has two bags of gold mohurs placed on the back of a camel, and proclaims that he dares the thief of the necklace to steal the bags. The thief, dressed up as a Sannyāsin (ascetic), plies the driver of the camel with liquor, steals the camel with the mohurs, kills the camel, and buries its parts in deep pits. The king issues proclamation that the captor of the thief will receive a lakh of rupees. The son of the younger thief disguises himself as a woman, and goes from door to door, begging for camels' flesh, which the doctors have prescribed for her dying son. The wife of the elder thief's son takes pity, and gives him

some of the buried flesh.¹⁶ The queen's necklace is dug up there, along with other treasure, and, as the result of reciprocal criminations, the elder thief, the younger thief, and their two sons are buried alive.

From a Sinhalese source, Goonetilleke, *The Orientalist*, i. 56 ff., reports a story of a thief and his son which reminds one of the Mūladeva incident, above, and is clearly connected with the Fagin idea: A poor laborer, as a last resort, goes out into the world to try his luck in the art of stealing, leaving his wife behind, pregnant. The woman, in utter want, goes from house to house pounding paddy for a small remuneration in rice. In due time she brings forth a boy, and they live together precariously for fifteen years, during which there is no sign of the father. At the end of that period she almost despairs of his return, and bids the boy go in search of his father. The cunning boy thinks, not without reason, that it will be impossible to find a father whom he has never seen, but, dissembling before his mother, starts out with the intention of practicing theft.

In his rambles he comes, one night, to a resthouse, where he finds an elderly man with a carpet-bag, on which he bestows more than ordinary attention, while affecting to be unconcerned about it. This the boy manages to steal, returning with it to his mother. To their unbounded joy it is found to contain jewels, precious stones, silver, and gold, so that their happiness is only marred by the absence of the boy's father.

One day, the woman observes a man with a dirty loin cloth, wending his way towards the house. She recognizes him as her husband, and receives him with unchanged love and tears of joy. She first tells him about the boy, and then inquires whether he has been successful in his attempts at stealing. He tells her that he had amassed riches, but that, on returning home, he had stopped at a resthouse, and been robbed by a young and simple boy. Needless to say, that boy is his own son. When the boy comes upon the scene the man runs up to him, and carries him in his arms to the house, embracing and kissing him all the time. The family now live on the pinnacle of happiness.

¹⁶ For this meat ruse, see Köhler, *Kleinere Schriften*, i. 203 ff.

RHAMPSINITUS.

Thieves, both old and young, exhibit most shiningly their resourcefulness, their daring, and their endurance in the type of the story of Rhampsinitus which has invaded India, as well as most other countries of the earth. This class of stories figures rather less in the literature of India than in its folklore, but its character is every where unmistakable. In the Southern Textus Amplior of the Pañcatantra¹⁷ King Mahāvīra of Madhurāpurī cuts off the head of a robber, Āracakravartin, as he breaks into the king's bed-chamber to steal a jewel-casket, and puts the head away in his treasure house. The thief's wife brings up his son Sukumāra, and sends him to school where he is taunted with the sobriquet of 'robber's son.'¹⁸ When he questions his mother she tells him his father's history, whereupon he determines to recover his father's head and throw it into the Gaṅgā.¹⁹

He goes to his father's teacher Ativarūṇa, and acquires thru him the entire 'Science of Thieving' (taskaramārga). Then he sends a gṛōka message to the king, and goes to Madhurā, disguised as a merchant. When the king reads the young thief's message, he has the city guarded day and night by his captain of police and 1000 soldiers. Sukumāra manages to poison this captain, as well as his successor, cuts off the hand of the second captain, fastens it to a pole, and makes a show of reaching with this hand into the king's treasury. The king strikes at the hand, which Sukumāra leaves behind as a token of his prowess. The king recognizes the hand as that of his police captain by a seal-ring on one of its fingers. In the meantime Sukumāra gets into the treasure house, puts on the armor, weapons, and diadem of the king, calls together the doorkeepers of the palace, and tells them that the thief has done so much harm to the city, because he wished to cast his father's head into the Gaṅgā; they had better do so themselves. So they do, and again he

¹⁷ See Hertel, ZDMG. LXI. 60 ff.

¹⁸ Taunting a boy on account of a real or supposed flaw in his descent is a favorite motif to be treated elsewhere. See, e. g., Jātakas 465, 539, and the Mūladeva story in Kathās. 124.

¹⁹ For the expiating virtue of this river see, e. g., Benfey, Pañcatantra, i. 52; ii. 528.

leaves a missive *gloka*, in which he brags of his daring and cunning deed.

In the story of the two thieves, *Ghaṭa* and *Karpara*, 'Pot,' and 'Kettle,' *Kathās*. 64.43 ff., the motif is varied very much. The two thieves break thru a wall of the palace into the bed-chamber of the princess, *Ghaṭa* remaining outside, *Karpara* entering. The princess promptly falls in love with him, and, after enjoying him, gives him wealth, promising more if he come again. One night, *Karpara*, intoxicated with love and wine, remains with the princess until day-break, is apprehended by the guards, and the king orders that he be put to death. His friend *Ghaṭa* comes to the execution, *Karpara* signals to him that he is to carry off and take care of the princess. Then he is hanged.

Ghaṭa carries off the princess to his own house; the king concludes that the kidnapper must have been a friend of *Karpara*. He issues orders to have the corpse watched. *Ghaṭa*, indeed, decides to lament over the body, to burn it, and to scatter the bones in some holy places. He first goes as a *Pācupata* ascetic with a pot of boiled rice and milk, places himself near *Karpara*, and lets the pot slip from his hand and break. Then he laments: 'O *Karpara* ("Pot"), full of sweetness!' Next he stupefies the guards with sweetmeats, mixed with *dhattūra*, and burns the corpse. Finally, with the aid of a wandering sorcerer, he bewilders the guards, so that he can carry off his friend's bones and throw them into the Ganges.

In *Ralston, Tibetan Tales*, pp. 37 ff., the precocious boy thief, whom we have met before (above, p. 203) is apprenticed to a weaver, thief by night. After testing the boy, and finding him ripe, the pair betake themselves to house-breaking. On the advice of the boy the weaver goes in legs first, lest, if his head should be cut off, its owner would be recognized, and his family plunged into ruin.

The weaver goes in, legs first. The cry of thieves is raised, the weaver is pulled in by the legs, the boy cuts off his head, and gets away with it. The king orders the headless trunk to be exposed at the crossroads. The boy, thinking it would be wrong not to embrace his 'Uncle,' and moan over him, assumes the appearance of a madman; takes to embracing everybody, includ-

ing animals; and then presses the trunk to his breast, and wails over it as long as he likes. Later on, he dresses up as a carter; drives a cart full of dry wood to the spot, and kindles it, so that the corpse is cremated. Then assuming the guise of a Brahman, he collects food by begging, makes from it five oblation cakes, and takes them as soul-offerings to the burial place of his Master. Finally, as Kāpālīka, or skull-carrying Īiva worshiper, he manages to fling the burned corpse into the Ganges, without being apprehended.

The king has a garden laid out on the Ganges, in which he places his daughter, ordering her to cry aloud in case any one tries to touch her. He also stations a guard near by. After sending down a number of floating water vessels the thief covers his head with one, swims to the princess, and tarries with her. This is reported to the king who thinks it a bad business.

In the meantime the princess bears a son, and the thief decides that he must not miss his son's birth-feast. The king assembles all the inhabitants of his realm in a huge enclosure. He then gives the princess' boy a wreath, and tells him to give it to his father, at the same time ordering his guards to lay hands on that man. The thief is brought before the king; the ministers advise that he be put to death. But the king says: 'O friends, so little does such a hero deserve to be put to death, that he ought much rather be carefully watched over.' Then he bestows upon the thief his daughter and half his kingdom.

In Chavannes, *Cinq Cent Contes*, vol. ii, p. 380, the story is similar. Both these Buddhist versions seem to be derived from Sinhalese sources which are reflected in folklore in three essentially identical reports; see Goonetilleke, *The Orientalist*, i. 59; Parker, *Village Folk-Tales of Ceylon*, iii. 41 ff., 43 ff. The gist of them is as follows: A clever thief and his yet cleverer son start out to steal a jewel casket which is kept at the foot of the king's bed. They enter by a narrow tunnel, the father in the lead. The tunnel gives on to the dining room where the father smells the sweet odor of tasty, left over food. He eats of it, filling not only his stomach, but also the whole passage to it from the throat. Then he steals into the king's bed-chamber and takes the casket. Returning to the mouth of the tunnel he hands the casket to his son and starts on the return trip. After creeping two or three cubits he finds that it is impossible to

make further progress, owing to the large dimensions his stomach has assumed.²⁰ The son with all his might pulls him by the head, but the man does not budge an inch. Either at the suggestion of the father or the son, according to the version, they decide that the boy must cut off his father's head, and take it with him, lest the king, recognizing the culprit, should inflict dire retribution upon his family. Moreover, the thief, if caught alive, would in any case be put to torture and death by the infuriated king. The son takes with him both casket and head which he properly throws into the expiatory waves of the river. He then reports the tragic event to his mother, and bids her to hide her anguish, lest it should betray them. When the corpse is found, one of the ministers says to the king: 'Sire, the love of those to whom one is dear must manifest itself by crying, or sobbing, when the dead body of the object of their affection is presented to their eyes. Command, therefore, the corpse to be dragged thru the town; when wife or mother sees it, she will give vent to her grief.' The king does so. When the corpse comes within the sight of his mother, the younger thief climbs upon a tree, and falls down on the ground. The woman rushes up to the boy, embraces him, and, under cover of this, gives full vent, with impunity, to the feelings induced by the sight of husband's corpse.²¹

The type of this story is well established in antiquity thru Herodotus' story (Euterpe 121.1) of the robbery of King Rhampsinitus' treasury by his own architect's son, who, in the end, is trapped and, at his own request, has his head cut off by his brother. A vast literature of filology and folklore recounts the diffusion of this story, under the captions, 'Rhampsinitus,' 'Master-Thief,' and 'Shifty Lad'; e. g., Benfey, *Das Pañcatantra*, i. 295; Tawney, *Translation of Kathāsaritsāgara*, vol. ii, pp. 93, 99; Ralston, *Tibetan Tales*, p. xlvii, and note on p. 43; and, especially for numerous Western versions, Reinhold Köhler, *Kleinere Schriften*, vol. i, pp. 200 ff. There is scarcely a single trait of the Hindu versions which may not also be found

²⁰ Motif, 'dickgefressener frosch,' for which see Weber, *Indische Studien*, iii. 364.

²¹ For this ruse see Köhler, *Kleinere Schriften*, vol. i, pp. 199, 202, 203, 208, 209.

in the Western versions, and it may be remarked that the Hindu stories are all from comparatively modern sources.

There is yet another Hindu story of the Rhampsinitus type, blended with another frequent motif, namely that of 'monkey and sword': In the Southern Pañcatantra (Dubois, p. 169) a king has a monkey with sword as his watchman. A Brahman official is in love with a courtesan who demands of him the king's necklace. The Brahman decides to steal it, despite the monkey. He takes with him a serpent which frightens the monkey, so that he drops his sword, and withdraws his attention from the king in order to protect himself. The Brahman seizes the opportunity to snatch the necklace. A touch of the same story, in the Rājasiṃhakathā of the Kathāprakāśa, reported by Eggeling in Gurupūjākāumudī, p. 122; in Langlès, Fables et Contes Indiens, p. 111 (reported by Hertel, Das Pañcatantra, p. 45); in the Gujarātī Pañcākhyānavārttika, nr. 42 (Hertel, *ibid.* p. 127); and Nirmala Pāṭhaka nr. 26 (Hertel, *ibid.* p. 277). The twelfth story of Siddhi-Kūr (Jülg, *Kalmükische Märchen*, pp. 58 ff.) shows us the master-thief, stealing the Chan's jewel (his life-index²²), after tying together the queues of the sleeping watch, and gagging the Chan himself. Benfey, *Das Pañcatantra*, vol. I, pp. 293 ff. has collected Western parallels to this aspect of the 'Master-thief.'

GOLD-BRICK.

The Americanism 'gold brick' describes very well the kind of swindle practised by thieves upon an outsider in the following prank: In Kathās. 24.82 ff., two thieves, named Āiva and Mādhava, go to Ujjayinī to plunder the rich and greedy king's chaplain, Āmkarasvāmin. Mādhava with retainers, disguised as a Rajput, settles in a village outside Ujjayinī. Āiva disguises himself as an ascetic, and, by practicing the usual austerities, acquires a great reputation. Among those who pay Āiva ostentatious devotion, Mādhava and his fellows figure conspicuously.

One day, Mādhava sends some of his gang to the chaplain, with a present of two garments, to tell him that he and other Rajputs wish to enter the service of the king. Next day, Mā-

²² See Ruth Norton's article previously cited, p. 213.

dhava himself with his retainers shows up, and says, 'I wish to enter into service to please my retainers, but I am rich.' The greedy chaplain presents Mādhava to the king, who accepts his service. Then the chaplain, intent on more presents, invites Mādhava to live in his house. Mādhava deposits in the chaplain's strong-room a box full of fake gems. He next pretends to be ill, and lets no doctor cure him, until one of his own rascals suggests the ascetic Īiva. Mādhava says that he will give the ascetic all his property, which again arouses the chaplain's greed. He goes to Īiva and begs him attend Mādhava, at the same time offering him his beautiful daughter Vinaya-svāminī as wife. Īiva pretends to demur, but finally consents to the arrangement, marries the maiden, gets the jewelry as his fee, and Mādhava is gradually 'cured' by his ministrations. After a while Īiva induces the chaplain to buy the jewels; on the proceeds the rascals live jubilantly.

In time, the chaplain, in need of money, takes one of the 'jewels' to a merchant, and is told that it is glass. Soon he finds that all the jewelry is bogus. He demands his money back of Īiva, but the latter contends that he has spent it all. They carry their altercation to the king, but Īiva pretends that he is innocent, as he, an ascetic, knows nothing about jewelry. Mādhava, in his turn, says that he has done nothing wrong, and that, if he has given away glass instead of gems, let his merit be only that of a giver of glass. That he had given in the honest conviction that his present was genuine, was proved by the fact that he had, on the strength of his gift, recovered his health. The king and his ministers, who 'are on,' laugh gleefully, and declare that neither Īiva nor Mādhava have done anything wrong. The chaplain departs with downcast countenance, minus his money.

'IT TAKES A THIEF TO CATCH A THIEF.'

The type of story here dealt with represents the natural idea that rogues will try on occasion to outwit one another, a task in which they sometimes succeed, but more often fail. In the latter case they gleefully recognize that they are both equally clever. The feature of passing 'gold bricks' upon one another is occasionally braided into these stories. I am acquainted with but

two stories of this sort in literature, both from Hemavijaya's Kathāratnākara, but the type is taken up rather eagerly by folk-lore.

In Hemavijaya's story, nr. 129 (Hertel's Translation, vol. ii, pp. 60 ff.), a thief, named Vasana, climbs up one night by means of a grappling-iron ('lizard,' above, p. 118) to the top of a Īiva temple, and knocks off the golden peacock placed there by King Puruṣadatta. He times his strokes to the beat of the hours, so that the sleeping watch is not disturbed.²³ To ensure his escape after he has come down he has brought with him a dead child; this he carries along with the loot, to the cry: 'Alas, I am a lonely old man, and now my son is dead, O Fate, O Fate!' Another thief, named Catura, 'Clever,' while being entertained by the courtesan Rūpasenā, hears him, and says to her: 'My child, the tears of this fellow are tears of joy, not tears of woe!' He follows Vasana, and lies down among the corpses in a cemetery, in order to find out the truth.

Vasana proceeds to bury the peacock in the cemetery, but is interrupted by the ill-omened cry of a she-jackal. He gathers that someone is observing him, therefore sticks his dagger into the hands, feet, necks, and bellies of the bodies lying about. When he pierces Catura's hand the latter does not utter a sound. After he has buried the peacock, Catura digs it out, and gives it to Rūpasenā, in order to prove his ingenuity. Next morning the king is grieved over the loss of his treasure, but Vasana promises to restore it. Reflecting that people suffering from dagger wounds cannot be cured without betel, he gets the king to issue an order which raises the price of betel-leaves to an exorbitant figure. Then he stands, in the garb of an ascetic, in the market place, and, when one of Rūpasenā's slave-girls buys betel, notwithstanding its high price, he tells the king that Catura is in the house of that courtesan. When Catura is taken he tells the entire story; the king is so pleased with the cleverness of both rascals, that he makes them promise to give up their profession, and makes them chamberlains of the palace.

In the second story of the Kathāratnākara (nr. 61; Hertel, vol. I, pp. 176 ff.) the thief Musala, on a friendly visit to the thief Siddhisuta, notices a golden bowl which he decides to steal.

²³ Cf. the boy-thief story above, p. 204.

Siddhisuta, aware of this, hangs the bowl full of water, on a little hammock over his bed. After he has dropped off to sleep, Musala sucks out the water by means of a hollow reed, and hides the dish in a pond. Missing his treasure next morning, Siddhisuta stealthily feels Musala's feet and shoes, and, finding them cold, concludes that he has hidden the bowl in the water. He tracks his friend's footsteps, to the pond, and takes the bowl out of the water. At breakfast Musala sees the bowl and is in doubt as to whether it is the same, or another bowl. As he is debating this in his mind, Siddhisuta says to him: 'You eat, dear friend, it is the same bowl.' Musala goes home astounded at his friend's cunning.

The folklore supplies a large number of stories in which thieves sell 'gold bricks,' as well as practise a considerable variety of tricks upon one another, including the pond trick of the preceding. Thus, in Day, *Folk-Tales of Bengal*, pp. 160 ff., two thieves, having become notorious, decide to turn honest. They hire themselves out to a householder: the younger has a cow to tend; the elder must water a campaka tree. The ground about the tree absorbs so much water that its guardian has to draw water all day; the cow is so obstreperous that the other has to run after her all day. In the evening each pretends that he has a 'soft thing.' So they 'swap' jobs. Next evening they meet, and merely laugh at each other, without speaking a word. They decide that their former trade of thieving is to be preferred to this honest labor, as people call it.

At midnight they dig for treasure around the campaka tree. The younger thief comes on a jar full of mohurs, but says that it is merely a stone. While the younger sleeps, the elder digs and finds a second jar. He buries both jars in the mud of an adjoining tank, returns, and goes to sleep by the side of the other. When the younger thief awakes, and finds that his jar has been removed, he notices mud on the feet of his pal. He therefore concludes that the elder thief must have buried the jar in the tank. He walks around it; on three sides frogs jump into the water, but not on the fourth. He finds on that side the two jars, loads them upon the cow, and starts for his native village.

In the morning the elder misses the younger, and hurries to

the tank. Not finding the jars, he starts in pursuit. On the way he purchases a pair of shoes embroidered with gold lace. When he descries the younger trudging on slowly with his cow, he runs ahead of him and throws one shoe on the road. Then he runs ahead another 200 yards, throws down the other shoe, and hides in a tree nearby. The younger, coming along, sees the first shoe, admires it, but does not pick it up, one shoe being no good. When he comes to the second shoe, he ties the cow to the tree, and runs back for the first. The elder drives the cow with its load home. The younger catches on, arrives before the elder, and accosts him, saying, 'let's divide.' They divide all, except an odd mohur which is to be changed the next day. In the morning the older, who has the coin, pretends to be dead. The younger affects to pity his wife, makes a straw rope, and drags the body to the cemetery, but having no fire, climbs up a tree. A band of robbers pass by, and are cheered by the sight of the corpse, it being a good omen to see a corpse when going out to steal. They propose, if they succeed, to return and burn the corpse. They return with their loot, and as they put the corpse on the pyre, it gives forth an unearthly yell. The very moment the younger jumps from the tree with a similar yell. Thinking that an evil spirit has possessed the corpse, and that a ghost has jumped from the tree, they run away. The two thieves divide the loot.

This story is repeated essentially by Parker, *Village Folk-Tales of Ceylon*, vol. iii, pp. 321 ff.; and Naṭeśa Sāstrī, in *Indian Antiquary*, xxv. 21. For the shoe-trick outside of India, see Köhler, *Kleinere Schriften zur Märchenforschung*, vol. i, pp. 198, 210. Similar stories are reported by Knowles, *Folk-Tales of Kashmir*, p. 299; O'Connor, *Folk-Tales from Tibet*, p. 131; Parker, *Village Folk-Tales of Ceylon*, vol. ii, pp. 90 ff.; Swynerton, *Indian Nights' Entertainment*, p. 45; G. R. Subrahmah Pantula, *Folk-Tales of the Telegus*, p. 63; cf. also Parker, l. c., vol. i, p. 330 ff. In most of these occurs the slipper trick, which, thus far, is not quotable from Hindu literature, but has all the look of one of the refinements of the *Steyaṣāstra*. See also the story by Maṇisundara to Haribhadra's *Upadeśapada*, translated by Hertel, *Indische Märchen*, p. 90; and Benfey, *Das Pañcatantra*, i. 71 ff.

THIEVES' WISDOM.

Thieves are also represented as showing higher intellect or wisdom, that goes beyond the direct tricks of their trade. In Āṣṣadāsa's Kathārnava, nr. 25 (see Weber, Indische Streifen, vol. i, p. 251), the police bring a thief before the king, who orders him to be executed. The thief says: 'Lord, I am in possession of an incomparable art, take it, and do what you like.' The king says: 'If you know such an art, why do you engage in theft?' The thief replies: 'Only in the hand of one who has never stolen, does this art succeed.'²⁴ The king says to his minister: 'Do you take the art?' The minister says: 'Sire, I am thievish by nature, for the king's officials are, as it were, swallowed up by greed.' The king then tells his Purohita ('house-priest') to take the art, but he declines, because he is in the habit of pilfering from the offerings which the king makes to the gods. Then the king asks other members of his durbar, but among them all there is not a single righteous man. They all urge the king to receive the art, but he has to confess that he also had stolen while he was crown-prince.²⁵ The thief says: 'Where king, and minister, and Purohita do steal, how can I act otherwise?' The king sets him at liberty.

The story occurs, more elaborately, in the Puruṣaparīkṣā:²⁶ Four thieves are caught; three are executed. The fourth claims to own the art of sowing gold seeds which grow into gold shrubbery. The sequel is much the same. The story occurs also in the Hasyavidyākathā of the Kathāprakāṣa; see Eggeling in Gurupūjākāumudī, p. 120. With it is related the 75th story of Hemavijaya (Hertel, vol. i, pp. 215 ff.) in which pearl sowing is substituted for gold sowing, but the artful device is that of a merchant, not a thief.

THE ACME OF THE ART.

Resourcefulness and cunning, stoutly supported by dogged courage, continue thru life the sine qua non of a successful thief,

²⁴ Magic arts are valid only in the hands of the worthy: Jātaka 543 (part 4); Pārcvanātha Caritra 8. 157 ff.; Samarādityasaṁkṣepa 4. 128 ff.

²⁵ For princes as thieves see above, p. 103.

²⁶ Text published by Brockhaus in Transactions of the Saxon Academy, 1857, pp. 36 ff., translated by J. J. Meyer, Daṣakumāracarita, pp. 69 ff.

and they are the pivotal ideas around which thief stories revolve. *Mahābhāṣya* 5.3.66 tells of thieves so clever that they steal ointment off eyes. Grammarians and lexicographers report a word *paḡyatoḥara* 'one who steals while you look on.'²⁷ This word I can now quote from *Samarādityasaṃkṣepa* 5.30. As regards shrewdness, *Hemavijaya's* 61st story (*Hertel*, vol. i, p. 177) has one of those tripartite proverbs, beloved of the *nīti*, to wit: 'A merchant without eloquence, a thief without shrewdness, and an unchaste mistress are mere cattle in human form.'

Accordingly we find the profession informed with a sort of intellectuality. *Vedabbha Jātaka* (48) and *Pāṇiya Jātaka* (469) describe a class of thieves called 'Despatchers' (*pesana-kacora*) which quite speak for themselves: 'In a forest dwelt five hundred robbers, known as the "Despatchers," who made the way impossible. "Why, now, were they called the Despatchers?"—Well then, of every two prisoners they made they used to despatch one to fetch the ransom, and that is why they were called Despatchers. If they captured a father and a son, they told the father to go for ransom to free his son; if they caught a mother and her daughter, they sent the mother for the money; if they caught two brothers, they let the elder go; and so, too, if they caught a teacher and his pupil, it was the pupil they set free.'

In *Divyāvadāna*, p. 175, there is a rather luscious description of some 'park-thieves' (*udyānaṃoṣaka*) whose sly performance must have elicited the admiration of the profession: Thieves were accustomed to roam daily in the parks of *Grāvastī*. Whenever they came upon a sleeping man, they would kick him with their feet and tell him to get up and go. If he did not wake up they would rob him and get away.

Anent all this there is a Tamil story, reported by *De Rosairo* in *The Orientalist*, ii. 183, on the chief acquirements of the complete thief: it has not turned up yet in literature, but is sure to do so: A king wishes to study the Art of Stealing, in order to mete out more perfect justice. His learned minister presents before him a notorious thief and pilferer. After the king has dismissed all attendants, he expresses his desire to be-

²⁷ These gentry were graduated, without doubt, from *Fagin's* school (above, pp. 202 ff.). See *Mallinātha Caritra* 7. 716.

come the thief's pupil. To his surprise, the thief pleads ignorance of the art of stealing, and asserts that he has been most unjustly accused. The king dismisses him, but on the next day misses his signet-ring off his ring finger. The thief, tho asserting his innocence, is condemned to be impaled upon a three-pronged stake. But the king, uneasy in his mind, disguises himself, and goes in the still of the night to the place of execution. As he comes near he hears the thief, in pitiful accents, address the Almighty Creator, pleading his innocence, and calling for vengeance from heaven on the head of him who had judged him so wrongly and pronounced so unjust and heavy a punishment. The king has the thief set free, but on the next morning, the thief appears once more, and, with expressions of respect and civility, presents to His Majesty the lost signet-ring. When asked to explain, the thief says: 'May it please Your Majesty, I have the ring, because I played my part with alacrity and decision. Should your Majesty wish to follow my profession, there would be no difficulty in doing so, if you could but behave as I did, namely, maintain a lie even when put to extreme trial. My behavior is the first lesson in the art Your Majesty is desirous of being taught.'

NOBLE THIEF.

Thieves generally are as rough and mean as they can be, regardless of noble men and even gods. They are often found in the company of gamblers, pimps, and drunkards; e. g., Hemavijaya, Kathāratnākara, story 46 (Hertel, vol. i, p. 136). The thief Kharpara uses the oil in the lamp hung before the statue of the goddess Harasiddhi to lubricate the cakes which he has baked on the coals of a funeral pyre. The goddess sticks out her tongue to frighten him, but succeeds in frightening only the good people of the town. 'Draw your tongue back into your mouth, harlot, or I shall smash you to pieces with this stone,' threatens Kharpara, frightens the goddess, and obtains a reward in gold for his magic power (Hemavijaya, Kathāratnākara, story 110; Hertel, vol. ii, pp. 19 ff.)

Dogs generally are considered Pariahs among quadrupeds, just as crows among the birds; see, e. g., *Indische Sprüche* 3850. But even a dog shows gratitude and watches for his

owner (Sprüche, 2184, 4427). In Hemavijaya, story 125 (Hertel, ii. 45 ff.) the kind physician Kuntala hears from a bard the following verse: 'Who can assert that a low man is to be compared with a dog? If you help both, the dog will guard your money; the other will rob you and run away.' Nevertheless the good doctor cures first a dog and then a thief; the thief breaks into his house, kills the dog, and runs off with the loot.

But it cannot be said that fiction dwells very insistently upon this class of traits; rather more frequently and not a little paradoxically, it moves along the line of the thief's better nature, culminating in noble thief, or converted thief. Apahāravarman, in the second story of *Daçakumāracarita*, to be sure a prince by birth, is the type of noble and generous thief (Robin Hood), who not only plunders the rich to give to the poor, but also aids a loving couple, by first bringing them together, and then steering them into the haven of happiness. In *Vetālapañcaviṅcati* 10; *Kathāsaritsāgara* 84; *Baitāl Pachīsī* 9; *Vedāla Cadai* 10, a merchant, Arthadatta, has a beautiful daughter, Madanasenā, with whom falls in love at sight a merchant's son, named Dharmadatta. She is betrothed to one Samudradatta, yet promises Dharmadatta to come to him on her bridal night. On that occasion she averts her face from her husband; he tells her to go to whom she loves, since she does not care for him. Madanasenā insists that he alone is dear to her, but that she has made a promise, and she has never yet broken one.

Samudradatta, thinking her the victim of passion, lets her go. On the way she is seized by a thief. When she offers him her jewels he refuses, being smitten with her beauty. She then tells him her story, and begs him to wait a while, since she must keep her promise.²⁸ He lets her off; she goes to Dharmadatta and tells him everything. Touched by her faithfulness, he bids her return to her lawful allegiance. Then she returns to the thief who also lets her go with her jewels. Cf. with this the

²⁸ Cf. the corresponding story in Hemavijaya, above, p. 200. For the motif, 'Promise to return,' see my 'Life and Stories of the Jaina Savior Pārçvanātha,' p. 183. See also Hemavijaya, story 68 (Hertel, vol. I, p. 199); story 82 (ib. p. 235); *Divyāvadāna*, p. 377; *Old Gujarātī Pañcākhyānavārttika*, story 26. Cf. Hertel, *Jinakīrti's Geschichte von Pāla und Gopāla*, p. 67.

story of the generous robber (Bodhisat) in Satapatta Jātaka (279) who lets off a poor man who has collected a debt of a thousand pieces.

We have previously met in the Agaladatta stories the robber who offers his victorious opponent his treasure; see Jacobi, *Ausgewählte Erzählungen*, pp. 68, l. 7; 80, ll. 38 ff. More significant than these highly colored, romantic effusions are certain indications that the profession, in truth, does not altogether eradicate ordinary decency of feeling in its votaries. In the *Daridravarṇana*, 'Description of poverty,' in the *Ārṇadhara Paddhati*, stanza 9, a poor man says to his wife: 'Hand me the rag, or take the boy into your own lap.' The wife responds: 'There is nothing here on the floor, husband, but behind you there is a heap of straw.' A thief, come to steal, hears them, throws a strip of cloth which he has gotten elsewhere over the boy, and goes off in tears. In *Viracarita*, adhyāya 26, (*Indische Studien*, xiv. 138), five robbers come from Ayodhyā to mount *Ṣaṭaṅga*. There lives an ascetic, *Sutapas*, who, during a famine, has gone from home, leaving his family behind. The robbers, out of pity, support the family, and thus save its life. After twelve years *Sutapas* returns, rejoices to find, contrary to expectation, that his family is alive, and rewards the robbers with magic gifts.

In *Pārṣvanātha Caritra* 2.619 ff. a young thief *Mahābala*, son of a good family, to be sure, decides to steal in the house of a merchant, *Datta*. As he peeks into the house thru a lattice window he hears *Datta* quarreling bitterly with his son over some trifling disagreement of accounts. Out of decency he reflects, that a man who will abandon sleep in the middle of the night, and quarrel with his diligent and proper son over such a trifle, will die of a broken heart if he were to steal his property. So he goes to the house of a courtesan, *Kāmasenā*. He sees her lavish her professional ministrations upon a leprous slave, as tho he were a god. He decides that he cannot steal from any one as greedy for money as all that. Then he goes to the house of a Brahman, and sees him sleeping with his wife on a couch. A dog urinates into the Brahman's outstretched hand, who says, 'Thank you,' as he rises with a start. The thief reflects that such is the Brahman's greed for alms, that it persists even while

he is asleep. He, therefore, must not steal there. He then decides to eschew mean folk, and breaks into the king's palace.²⁹

In *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 17 (Tawney's Translation), *Varāraja*, destined by his horoscope for kingship, is temporarily a thief. Once he digs a tunnel into a merchant's house, and is stealing his wealth, when his hand slips into a bowl of curds. He says to himself, 'I have eaten in this house,' and so he leaves all the merchant's possessions there, and goes out.

THIEVES' CONVERSION.

These possibilities of thieves' character are turned to account by Buddhist and Jain writers in stories of the conversion of thieves. The Buddhists have the familiar classic story of the thief *Aṅgulimāla* who, as his name shows, wore a necklace of his victim's fingers. He was converted by the Buddha, and became an *Arahat*; see *Majjhima Nikāya*, nr. 86; *Mahākāṇha Jātaka* (469); *Mahāsuttasoma Jātaka* (537); *Mahāummagga Jātaka* (546).³⁰ Thieves of lesser repute are converted in *Dhammapada Commentary* 8.9^b, 10; 25.7. Jaina religion treats *asteya*, 'abstention from theft,' formally, as one of its religious vows (*vrata*); hence such stories as those of *Mahābala* or *Ṛṣigupta* in *Pārṣvanātha Caritra* 2.615 ff.; 8.237 ff. In *Kathākoṣa*, pp. 214, 217, the condemned thief *Piṅgala* takes refuge with *Davadantī* who then proclaims her chastity (*saccakiriyā*); by its might the thief's bonds are broken, and the bailiffs driven to a distance. *Piṅgala* then takes upon himself the observance of vows, goes to *Tāpasapura* where he places himself in *kāyotsarga* posture in a cemetery, so as to be singed by the fire of the funeral pyres. He meditates on religion (*dharmadhyāna*); remembers the formula of the five chiefs of the faith (*parameṣṭhi-namaskāra*); reprobates his former sins; dies; and becomes a god.³¹ The thief *Prabhava*, *Pariṣiṣṭaparvan* 2.173, breaks into the house of wealthy *Jambū*, just at the moment when *Jambū* is about to leave behind him his eight beloved wives and his

²⁹ The dramatic conclusion of this story, above, pp. 123 ff.

³⁰ In all three *Jātakas*, in the story of the present.

³¹ According to Leumann, in a note to Tawney's Translation of *Kathākoṣa*, p. 214, l. 34 (see p. 242) this storiette occurs also in *Āvaṇyaka Nir yukti*. See also *Mallinātha Caritra* 6. 347 ff.

wealth, worthless as a blade of grass, and turn ascetic. Prabhava listens to Jambū's exposition of the futility of earthly power and pleasure to such purpose, that he follows Jambū as his disciple and sits as a marala bird at the lotus of Jambū's feet (*ibid.* 3.290 ff.).

The Rāuhineya Caritra is a Jaina text which describes the rather jolly adventures of the thief Rāuhineya who is ultimately converted to the true religion and goes to heaven.³² From the same sphere of conceptions comes a story in the Samyaktvakāumudī, reported by Weber in the Transactions of the Berlin Academy, 1889, pp. 731 ff.: King Uditodaya and his minister Subuddhi wander thru the city by night. Themselves invisible, they see a man's shadow, but not the man. The minister explains that this is the thief Suvarṇakhura (or Lohakhura), skilled in the use of magic salves and pills. By means of these he makes himself invisible, so that he cannot be caught when he breaks into houses. All three, king, minister, and thief, listen to a merchant's account of his conversion to Jainism, which was the result of the curious experiences of the thief Rūpyakhura (the listening thief's father). Rūpyakhura, invisible, habitually ate with the king, and could not be caught, until he was made, by a trick, to shed tears which washed the salve from his eyes. He was impaled, but went to heaven by the virtue of a holy saying.

ROMANCE.

Pity moves Davadantī in Kathākoṣa, p. 215, to stake her highest in the rescue of a thief; see above, p. 220. Once more, *ibid.* pp. 125 ff., a thief, adorned for execution, his eyes rolling with fear, falls at the feet of Prince Virāṅgada, crying out,

³² This story, full of incidents characteristic of the life and practices of thieves, may now be skanned conveniently in Helen Moore Johnson's article 'Rāuhineya's Adventures,' Studies in Honor of Maurice Bloomfield, pp. 159 ff., and in Hemavijaya, story 81 (*Hertel*, vol. i, pp. 81 ff.). The adventures of Rāuhineya are treated also in the 11th chapter of the Mahāvīra Caritra; in a kathā told in the commentary to Hemacandra's Yogaśāstra; and in a drama, entitled Prabuddha-Rāuhineyam, edited by Muni Puṇyavijaya in the Jaina-Ātmānanda-Grantharatnamālā, Nr. 60 (Bhāvnagar, Vikrama-Saṁvat 1974). See Hultzsch in ZDMG. vol. lxxv, pp. 65 ff. All these lead up to Rāuhineya's ultimate conversion.

'Protect me.' The prince does so at the price of being banished by his father, the king. Similarly Prince Sanatkumāra in *Samarādityasaṃkṣepa* 5.30 ff. secures the release of highly trained thieves—they steal while you look on (*paçyatoharāḥ*), so that the honest town-folk are enraged, and the king, his father, gives orders that in future thieves shall be executed without the prince's knowledge. This clemency is the more warranted, because, in the teeth of Manu's caution, innocent persons are sometimes accused or executed on unjust suspicion (see above, pp. 121 ff.). Thus *Mitrānanda*, *Kathākoça* p. 157, dies innocently as a thief, because of a fault committed in a former birth (see p. 158). In *Samarādityasaṃkṣepa* 6.73 ff. *Dharaṇa* rescues the *Cāṇḍāla Māurika* who is unjustly accused of theft by ransoming him for a huge sum.

Love is akin to pity. The blend of the two we have seen in the *Harūn-ar-Rashīd* stories, in which the female accomplice of the thief occasionally saves the king who has been lured in to the thief's den (above, pp. 196 ff.). There is another, fairly settled type of story in which a woman: maiden, courtesan, or even princess falls in love with a thief, usually as he is being led off to execution. Thus the conclusion of the story of the heroic thief who is overcome by King *Viraketu*³³ and his army is as follows: When the robber is led with beat of drum to the place of execution, a wealthy merchant's daughter, *Ratnavatī*, who until that moment had disliked the male sex so much that she did not desire even God *Indra* for a husband, sees him from her palace. Tho he is wounded and begrimed with dust, she becomes distracted with love, and says to her father: 'I select as my husband this man here, who is being led off to execution, so ransom him from the king, my father. If you will not, I shall follow him to the other world.' The merchant offers all his wealth as ransom, but the king is implacable and will not make over to him that thief who had robbed on so colossal a scale, and whom he had captured at the risk of his own life. The robber is impaled by the executioners, and, as his life is ebbing away on the stake, he sees *Ratnavatī* coming there with her kin-folk. When he hears the whole story from the people, he enig-

³³ *Vetālapañcaviṃṣati* 13 (above, p. 195) and the repetition in *Kathāsaritsāgara* 112.

matically weeps for a moment, and then laughs a little,²⁴ and then dies on the stake. The merchant's daughter, as satī, has the body taken down from the stake, and ascends the funeral pyre with it.

The dramatic quality of this story from beginning to end, its unity and intrinsic justice is not easily excelled. A parallel story, *Kaṇavera Jātaka* (318), scarcely descends from this high plane: The Bodhisat is born in a village of Kāsi, in the home of a householder, under the star of a robber. He grows up as a bold robber, strong as an elephant. After breaking into a rich man's house, and carrying off his treasure, the king orders the governor of the city to seize him. When the governor has effected the capture of the thief, with the money upon him, the king bids him cut off his head. Then the governor has the thief's arms tightly bound behind him, places a wreath of red *kaṇavera* flowers about his neck, sprinkles brick-dust on his head, has him scourged with whips on every square, and led to the place of execution to the beat of the harsh-sounding drum.

At this time lives in Benares the grand hetaera Sāmā, favorite of the king, surrounded by a suite of 500 female slaves. Her price is a 1000 pieces. As she stands at a window of her palace she sees the handsome robber led by, and falls in love with him. She sends one of her slaves with a large bribe to the governor, to say that the prisoner is Sāmā's brother, and that he should let him escape. The governor consents on the condition that a substitute be found. Now at this time a rich young merchant, enamored of Sāmā, comes to her house, as usual in the evening. Sāmā takes the 1000, places it in her lap, and sits weeping. When the merchant asks the cause of her sorrow, she says: 'My lord, this robber is my brother, tho he never comes to me, because people say I follow a vile trade. When I sent a message to the governor, he intimated that for a thousand he would let the prisoner go. And now I cannot find any one to go. The youth undertakes the mission, and, in the dark of the night, the governor hands him over to the executioners, who cut off his head and impale his body.

Thenceforth Sāmā accepts naught at any other man's hand,

²⁴See for this widely applied motif, the author in *JAOS.* XXXVI, pp. 68 ff.

but lives with the thief in the seclusion of her palace. The thought occurs to him, 'If this woman should fall in love with another, she will have me too put to death, and take her pleasure with him; I must make haste to escape.' So he says to her, 'My dear, we always stay indoors, like tame cockatoos in a cage; let us disport ourselves in the garden.' She consents, and, under show of violent affection, he enters into a thicket of *kaṇavera* bushes, pretends to embrace her, chokes her into insensibility, strips her of her jewels, and escapes. When she comes to, she asks her attendants what has become of her young lord. They do not know. 'He thinks,' she says, 'I am dead, and must in his alarm have run away. Not till I have set my eyes on my dear lord, will I rest upon a sumptuous couch.' She lies down upon the ground, and, from that day, she neither puts on comely garments, nor eats more than one meal, nor affects scents and wreaths.³⁵ She finally sends for some actors and gives them a 1000 pieces, and bids them, as they travel thru villages, towns, and cities, to recite a stanza whose import is: 'Sāmā lives, and lives for thee.' When they find the robber, and deliver their message, he replies:

'Sāmā's fancy ever roves,
From tried faith to lighter loves,
Me too Sāmā would betray,
Were I not to flee away.'³⁶

The actors return and tell their experience. Sāmā, full of sorrow, takes once more to her old course of life.

The same story, with a different ending, is told in *Sulasā Jātaka* (419), echoed in *Dhammapada Commentary* 8.3,³⁷ of the grand hetaera *Sulasā*. The thief here tires of his liaison, takes *Sulasā*, under pretense of sacrificing to a tree-deity, to a mountain-top, and there coolly tells her that he means to kill her, and go off with her jewels. In vain she reminds him of the benefits she has showered upon him. She then asks to be permitted to circumambulate him by way of final mark of devo-

³⁵ For the theme 'devoted hetaeras,' see the author, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. LII, pp. 630 ff.

³⁶ Francis and Neil's *Translation of the Jātaka*, vol. iii, p. 42.

³⁷ For other parallels to this story see *Burlingame's Buddhist Legends*, vol. ii, p. 227 (*Harvard Oriental Series*, vol. XXIX).

tion, and, when she comes behind him, with the strength of an elephant, throws him down the mountain precipice, so that he is crushed to pieces and dies.

At this point our theme laps over and blends with another theme, the *strī-veda*, or woman's wiles, whose purpose is to illustrate woman's cruelty and fickleness. This is the type of *Sussondi* (*Suṣroṇī*) and *Dhūminī* stories, in which a woman, well mated, takes up with a thief or robber. The thief suspects that she will make away with him, no less than with her lawful husband, and abandons her. Thus in *Culladhanuggaha Jātaka* (374); *Dhammapada Commentary* 24.7a; cf. *Kākāti Jātaka* (327) and *Sussondi Jātaka* (360). Also in the story of *Suṣroṇī*, *Ralston, Tibetan Tales*, pp. 142, 232 ff.; in the *Guṣārāṭi Pañcākhyānavārttika*, nr. 31 (goldsmith takes the place of thief; see above, p. 114); and in *Samarādityasaṃkṣepa* 6.455 ff. (above, p. 126); see the author in *JAOS.* XXXVI. 79. For the *Dhūminī* stories see J. J. Meyer, *Daṣakumāracarita*, pp. 87 ff. (with additional parallels and references).

DEFENSE.

There is no systematic defense against thieves, which, in any way, savors of *Steyaśāstra*. The responsibility for thieves rests with the king, and his governors, bailiffs, and soldiers. This they exercise as best they may, usually not too well, so that the people are angered and scandalized. The little that is done for defense is haphazard and opportunistic. In *Hitopadeśa* 2.8; *Southern Textus Amplior of Pañcatantra* 1.3 (Hertel, *ZDMG.* LXI. 23) a thief tries to steal a jewel from the head of an automatic *Vetāla* in front of the house of a courtesan, but is caught by the automaton, and made to ransom himself. This man-trap suggests possibilities which are, however, exploited no further. In *Hemavijaya's Kathāratnākara*, story 45 (Hertel, vol. i, p. 135) there is mention of a magic ring which protects against thieves. In *Kālakauṇḍi Jātaka* (83) a despised retainer, named 'Curse,' belies his name by turning out to be 'Blessing.' When robbers, in the absence of the master of the house, threaten to break in, he makes one servant beat a drum, another blow a conch, etc., so as to create the fiction of a house well able to

defend itself. The robbers throw down their weapons, and flee for their lives.³⁸

In *Mahāsāra Jātaka* (92) psychology is worked on a thief, so as to scare him out of keeping a jewel which he has stolen from the king's turban. When the venerable Ānanda comes to the palace, he finds everybody worried, and advises the king thus: 'Sire, you must have a large water-pot set in a retired corner of your courtyard, and a screen put up before it. Then order that all who frequent the precincts are to wash their hands behind the screen.' The thief, afraid of Ānanda's resourcefulness, conceals the jewel on his person, goes behind the screen, and drops it into the water, where it is duly found.

Just as thieves practice magic, so magic occasionally operates against them. In *Pañcīṣṭaparvan* 2.176 a band of thieves, under their leader Prabhava, break into the house of the Sage Jambū. By the supernatural power of his merit, they become stark like clay figures. This 'Dornröschen' charm is told prettily in a Tamil story, *The Orientalist*, ii. 22: Katirkāman, a poet, who has acquired magic power, awakes one night to find that some burglars have broken into the house, and are removing the goods. He scratches a spell on a palm-leaf, places it under his pillow, and goes to sleep again. When he awakes he finds all the thieves silent and motionless in the positions they occupied when the spell affected them, some with the goods on their heads or shoulders; others with their hands on keys or door-handles. When he speaks to them, they apologize humbly. He makes them put back the goods, gives them a bath and a good meal, tells them that in future they shall always have the right to eat and drink there.³⁹

³⁸ This belongs to the rubric, 'Bluff in Hindu Fiction'; see W. N. Brown in *A. J. P.* XLII. 122 ff.

³⁹ The motif, 'making stark' or 'spell-binding,' also in *Khaṇḍahāla Jātaka* (542), story of the present; *Hemavijaya*, story 105 (Hertel, vol. ii, p. 9); *Dharmakalpadruma* 4. 8. 98 (Hertel, *Indische Märchen*, p. 144); *Dharmacandra's Malayasundarikathoddhāra* (Hertel, *ibid.*, p. 186); *Old Gujarāṭī Pañcākhyānavārttika*, story 13; *Samarādityasaṃkṣepa* 6. 344; *Rāuhineya Caritra* 381; Parker, *Village Folk-Tales of Ceylon*, vol. ii, p. 342; vol. iii, pp. 62 ff., 307, 340. In *Rāuhineya Caritra* the magic is designated as *stambhinī* (sc. *vidyā*).

Thieves occasionally take fright for trivial reasons. In *Çukasaptati* 56 the merchant *Sāntaka*, returning home with some money he has collected, is attacked by thieves. He deposits his money before the statue of a *Yakṣa*, and pretends to present it to the *Yakṣa*. The thieves bow before the statue and retire. Then he takes up his money, and goes home. In Parker, l. c., iii. 222, some thieves sitting down to divide their loot are scared off by a blind prince, himself frightened, who cries out, 'Seize them, beat them, tie them!' In the same volume, p. 326, thieves are scared off by a woman whom they take to be a *Yakṣiṇī*; and, on p. 229, by a woman who sneezes. A more complex story, soldered together out of more or less familiar items, is reported by S. J. Goonetilleke, in *The Orientalist*, vol. i, pp. 39 ff. See also the Bengal folklore story, above, p. 214. A thief is tricked out of his booty in a pretty story which deals primarily with the resourcefulness of a virtuous woman, *Hemavijaya's Kathāratnākara*, story 16 (Hertel, vol. i, pp. 45 ff.).

RETRIBUTION.

'To the beat of the harsh-sounding drum.' Relatively humane punishments for theft are prescribed by the *Çāstras*, graded according as the thief steals for the first, second, or third time (*Manu* 9.277). The proof of theft must be substantial (*Manu* 9.270). There is no mention of torture. Fiction tells a different story: A suspected thief may be beaten to death by the bailiffs, as an incident of their man-hunt; thus *Mahāsāra Jātaka* (92). In *Mahāummagga Jātaka* (546; Fausböll, vi. 335) a thief is made helpless by having his hands and feet cut off; in *Cullapaduma Jātaka* (193) ears and nose are cut off in addition; in *Kathās*. 60.233 hands are cut off and tongue cut out. The idea that punishment for stealing may be graded is found in *Mūjapakkha Jātaka* (538), where a king sentences four robbers: one to receive a thousand strokes from a whip barbed with thorns; another to be imprisoned in chains; a third to be smitten with a spear; a fourth to be impaled.

As a rule the punishment is death, no less than for murder. In the tenth act of *Mṛcchakaṭikā*, *Cārudatta*, condemned for murder, is led to execution to the beat of the drum, his head

wreathed in a red karavīra branch, smeared with red sandal paste, the stake upon which he is to be impaled upon his shoulder. The beat of the drum proclaims his sentence at four different designated stations. This tallies remarkably with the description in Kaṇavera Jātaka (318), where a thief, his arms trussed, wearing a wreath of red kaṇavera (karavīra) flowers around his neck, brickdust sprinkled on his head, is scourged with whips in every square, and is led to execution to the beat of the harsh-sounding drum. The wreath of death (vajjhamālā), made of kaṇavera blossoms, occurs again in Mahāpaduma Jātaka (472); wreath and brickdust in Mahāummagga Jātaka (546; Fausböll, vi. 406). In Culladhammapāla Jātaka (358) the executioner also wears a crimson wreath, red being the color of Yama (Pluto). In Kathās. 10.171; 112.166, the drum of death is beaten either behind, or in front of thieves, led to execution. What is meant by 'peacock bonds' with which a thief is tied, in Kathākoṣa, p. 214, does not appear.

Execution is for the most part by impalement,⁴⁰ either alive,⁴¹ or after decapitation, or mutilation.⁴² In Daṣakumāracarita ii.1 the splendid thief Pūrṇabhadra fights and overcomes with his bare hands the elephant Mṛtyuvijaya who is to trample him to death, or to pierce him with his tusks. This mode is mentioned also in Kulāvaka Jātaka (31). In Mahāpaduma Jātaka (472) a thief is cast down a cliff (corapāta); in Kathās. 64. 53 a thief is hanged upon a tree. So also the thief Lobhasāra ('Essence-of-Greed') in Dharmacandra's Malayasundarikathoddhāra (Hertel, Indische Märchen, p. 234).

Buddhist texts revel in accounts of fiendishly ingenious tortures inflicted on criminals. Thus, incidentally, Sarabhaṅga Jātaka (522; Fausböll, v. 126); Mahāummagga Jātaka (546; Fausböll, vi. 453). J. J. Meyer, Daṣakumāracarita, pp. 36, 358, cites and discusses passages from the Milindapañho and Majjhima-Nikāya. They are known in Sinhalese Folk-lore as the 32

⁴⁰ Tantrākhyāyikā 1. 16.

⁴¹ Thus explicitly, of a woman, Divyāvadāna, p. 447, 1. 8, jivanti-gūlāni kārayati.

⁴² Manu 9. 276.

tortures; see Parker, *Village Folk-Tales of Ceylon*, vol. ii, p. 20; iii. 443 (listed with their Sinhalese names).⁴³ There is no reason to believe that thieves were exempted from such inflictions. Astoundingly paradoxical is their use at all in communities supposed to be ruled by the Religion of Pity.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

⁴³ A more lenient attitude on the part of Sinhalese law towards thieves, in the quotations by Parker, *Village Folk-Tales of Ceylon*, vol. ii, p. 115.

II.—TIBULLUS AND OVID.

PART II.

V. *Study of the Language.*

The aim of the present study is twofold. First, an attempt is made to exhibit to the eye, by the use of bold-faced type, the great number of verbal likenesses, parallel passages, half-lines, verse 'tags,' &c., which unite these elegies with the received works of Ovid, *but which never occur in the genuine Tibullus*. In this form of presentation I have followed very largely the method of Pease in his study of the *Hercules Oetaeus* of Seneca (*Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* XLIX [1918], p. 3), except that the exact order of the words and their position in the verse, though usually the same in the several cases, is not stressed to the same extent as in Pease. Bold-faced type is used, however, not only for striking phrases, such as *pone metum* (4, 15), but sometimes also for important single words, such as *violente* (2, 3). More often, however, the striking single word is relegated entirely to the accompanying commentary, as *adnue* (5, 20). An asterisk (*) placed before a single word indicates that it does not occur in the genuine Tibullus; single words treated in the notes occur also in Propertius, *unless the contrary is expressly stated*. Second, the verbal resemblances are accompanied by a running commentary, given in a brief form and concerned with the phrases, idioms and single words which display distinctive peculiarity of usage. In this way it becomes possible for the reader to see at a glance whether the Ovidian words and idioms are peculiar to Ovid alone, or whether they are common to him with Catullus, Vergil and Propertius; unfortunately it has not been found possible always to include Lucretius, upon whom he is also often dependent. In all statistics the 'Tibullan Appendix' includes not only Books III and IV, but also II 2, 3 and 5. The usage of the 'Vergilian Appendix' is often, but not always given.

I may add that the full power of proof respecting the authorship of the poems belongs more to the exact and minute study of the language which is attained through the application of the second principle mentioned above than it does to the gen-

eral collection of stereotyped and well-worn phrases, which is one of the chief results—though by no means the sole result—of adopting the first of the two methods named.⁷⁰ In other words, the form of study which yields real and convincing proof is the one already so well exemplified and so well applied by Ehrengruber and by Holtschmidt; Kleemann's study of the Lygdamus poems, though really adequate and wholly sound, was less comprehensive in its plan, and hence was incapable of convincing hasty and prejudiced readers. That the mere collection of phrases leads nowhere in the determination of authorship, may easily be seen from Ganzenmüller's meritorious study, "Aus Ovids Werkstatt," *Philologus* LXX [1911], pp. 274-311. In accordance with the purpose of his article, Ganzenmüller collects only phrases and word-complexes, and though he includes Tib. II 2. 3. 5 and Tib. IV in the scope of his work, we obtain from his article only a little more information upon these elegies than we can easily acquire by the use of any one of the fuller and better commentaries. Thus in the whole of Tib. IV the only expressions which he cites that are not discussed and paralleled in the ordinary edition are *latebras intrare ferarum* (3, 9), *casta manu* (20), *rapidæ aquæ* (4, 8), *pone metum* (15), *nil opus est* (21).⁷¹ These form an excellent beginning, to be sure, but since it was not his purpose to inquire in each case whether he was dealing with a familiar and stereotyped phrase or an Ovidian peculiarity, he has apparently not even aroused his own suspicions as to the actual state of affairs. Finally, it may be observed that Ganzenmüller has brought together a surprising number of Ovidian passages based on Tib. II 6 (pp. 289-291) and, as he himself remarks (p. 309), on I 3. 4. 6. Does this great accumulation of parallel passages mean anything? In my judgment, it means absolutely nothing except imitation, especially as the selection of parallels is often quite arbitrary. If, however, any one of the elegies named should be examined and found to exhibit also Ovidian peculiarity of usage, it would then need to be given up at once. The possi-

⁷⁰ The first method is here, however, carefully safeguarded by the test of *non-occurrence in Tib.*

⁷¹ On the other hand, he omits many familiar parallels, as *lux mea* (3, 15), *atque utinam* (13, 5), &c.

bility too of a few Ovidian additions or interpolations in II 1. 4. 6 and in the elegies of Book I should perhaps be admitted, but any attempt actually to determine such passages is not likely to be successful.

Several scholars, it should be added, have already examined in part the language of Book IV and gained valuable results. Postgate has notably done this for IV 13, and the fine observations which Bürger has made upon various usages occurring in IV 2-6 will often be quoted in the following discussion. Hennig (*Untersuchungen zu Tib.*, Wittenberg 1895, p. 14) has briefly touched upon the vocabulary of IV 7, and Belling (pp. 44 f.), seeking to refute him, has made in jest a few brief but good notes upon other elegies. Since Belling is one of the best of Tibullan critics, we cannot doubt that if he had undertaken his task seriously, he would have made important discoveries at this point also. Cartault too (*Le distique élégiaque*, Paris, 1911), as we shall have occasion to see later, has at times applied the principle of 'specific peculiarity' to the metric of the Tibullan Corpus, and his wonderful industry and erudition easily bring the necessary results clearly before his eyes, but through some lack of courage and of confidence,—through an excess of diffidence or of scepticism—he is led again and again to renounce his own brilliant discoveries at the very moment of making them.⁷²

It is needless to say that these elegies do not contain *all* the idioms which are associated with the fully developed dactylic virtuosity of Ovid and which are conveniently enumerated by Zingerle (*Ovid u. s. Vorgänger* I 13 ff.) and Eschenburg (*Wie*

⁷² This is not wholly the result of accident. Lessing, in his immortal saying, thought the pursuit of difficult truth exhilarating and noble, but to Cartault it often seems unduly adventurous and even foolhardy. Most of the problems of the Tibullan Corpus appear to him "insoluble enigmas," cf. *Corp. Tib.* 549: "Il est probable que les esprits aventureux, qui n'aiment dans la philologie que les problèmes insolubles, ne cesseront pas sur ce terrain leurs efforts décevants et stériles." It is not surprising then that he speaks (pp. 420, 480, 488) of the erudite and valuable work of Ehrengreber or Belling as 'fatigant,' and that splendid as is his own contribution in the *Corpus Tib.* to our knowledge of Tibullan criticism, he is sometimes lacking in generosity and magnanimity towards his great predecessors.

hat Ovid einzelne Wörter verwandt, 2 ff.),⁷³ yet they show, in my judgment, a far greater number of Ovidianisms than are actually needed for purposes of valid proof.

Tibullan corpus IV, 2.

2 **spectatum** e caelo, si *sapis, ipse **veni** A. A. 1, 99: **si sapis** Copa 29; Am. 2, 2, 9; 3, 4, 43; Rem. 372; frgm. 4 (Baehr.): **ipse veni** H. 1, 2; 8, 24; cf. II 5, 6.

2 *spectatum* Tib. never uses supine; Ov. often, as M. 7, 805; T. 3, 7, 1. *sapis 22 Ov.; si sapis Prop. 2, 16, 7; cf. 2, 17, 10; si sapiet Cat. 35, 17; qui sapit IV 13, 8; si sapitis A. A. 1, 643; 2, 173; other forms of si sap-, M. 14, 675; H. 5, 99; 20, 174; 15, 210; 17, 257; Rem. 477; T. 2, 13; cf. Am. 3, 8, 25.—According to Bürger, *Charites* 385, si sapis belongs to the colloquial language.

3 hoc Venus ignoscet: at tu, **violente**, caveto H. 3, 61; M. 9, 121; Ib. 29.

4 ne tibi miranti ***turpiter** arma cadant, v. note.

6 ***accendit** ***geminas** ***lampadas** acer Amor F. 4, 493.

7 illam, quidquid agit, *quoquo vestigia movit

3-7 ignoscet: final syllable here, as also II 2, 5, lengthened by arsis, as often in Ov. in penth. caesura before *et*, (*at*), *aut*; v. Siebelis-Polle's Register to *Met.*, s. v. *Arsis*, and Müller, *R. M.*², 405. Voc. *violente* (-a) not in Lucr., Cat., Verg., Hor., Prop.; owing to restoration of final *s*, the metrical use of apostrophe (Köne, p. 47) in Ov. exceeds that of all other Roman poets together. Similar is the usage of Lygdamus and of II 5 and 3, cf. Ehr. I 29; for the same excess of apostrophe also in the *Dirae*, *Culex* and *Ciris*, v. Naeke, pp. 311-313, also Eldridge, *Culex et Ciris*, pp. 62, 64 ('allocutio'); for the *Aetna*, v. Ellis, *Proleg. XXIX* and Sudhaus on v. 85, 582-86, 630.

**turpiter* 1 Cat., 0 Lucr., 0 Verg., 19 Ov., 1 Prop., 3 Hor. Cf. *tela* (viris) . . . *cadunt* F. 3, 225; M. 12, 496. **accendo* II 5, 90; 24 Ov. (*a. faces* 2, *a. taedas* 1 Ov.) **geminus* 83 Ov. **lampas* (Grecism) 5 Lucr., 5 Verg., 0 Cat. Prop. Hor., 8 Ov.; Tib. has 4 *fax*, 1 *taeda*, and sedulously avoids Grecisms (Bürger, *Charites* 387). (*acer Amor* Tib. 2, 6, 15; H. 4, 70; P. 4, 7, 40.) (*quidquid agit* Tib. I, 6, 66; often in Ov., as P. 2, 7, 4; T. 3, 7, 5, etc.) *vestigium* 1 Tib., 3 Tib. app., 42 Ov. Tib. never has *v.* in meaning of *pedes* as here, but *pedem* ponere 1, 2, 20;

⁷³ Considerable indications of the coming development of forms in *-bilis*, *-tate*, *-mine*, &c. appear in the *Culex*, as impietate (249), utilitate (66), revolvibilis (169), volumine (32), cacumina (54, 143), velamina (130), acumina (184), certamina, &c.; for some indications occurring in the Sulpicia elegies, see below (p. 256, cf. p. 242).

p. referre 1, 2, 48. 7, 62, v. Hartung, *De Paneg.* 44; Ehr. II 72, IV 49; Herr (p. 92) on Aetna 46. Ov. has often v. *facere, ferre, flectere, ponere* (the last also Pan. 13, Lydia 10). **quoquo* is drawn from Plautus and Terence; cf. *quaqua* Cu. 150.

8 componit **furtim** ***subsequiturque** Decor Her. 20, 131: ***subsequiturque** Am. 3, 13, 30; F. 2, 336; 4, 527.

8 *compono* in meaning 'adorn' not in Tib., but often in Ov. (cf. Ehr. IV 8), as Am. 2, 17, 10; M. 4, 318. **subsequor* 0 Cat. Verg. Prop., 1 Lucr., 1 Hor., 1 Aetna, 1 Praef. arg. Aen., 8 Ov.

9 seu solvit crines, **fusis** decet esse **capillis** M. 9, 90; cf. A. A. 3, 236.

9 Tib. never has *fusis*, but—1, 3, 8—the usual *effusis comis* (so also Ov. 8 times), and twice *solutis*. Ov. also has *fusae comae* twice; so also Prop. 3, 13, 18.

10 seu compsit, **comptis** est veneranda **comis** Am. 1, 1, 20; Her. 21, 88; F. 2, 560; P. 3, 3, 16, cf. Zing. *Abh.* II 88.

10 This v. gives the familiar 'Ovidian jingle,' v. Zingerle, *Kl. philol. Abh.* II 33 and IV 20; F. J. Miller's edition, p. 238; Siebelis-Polle, Reg. III, 'Gleichklänge' and 'Wortspiele'; Shuckburgh, 'Paronomasia,' e. g. A. A. 1, 244 et Venus in vinis ignis in igne fuit, arg. Bucol. 6 Corydon dilexit Alexin, which is heard again 11-12 *urit, seu . . . urit, seu*, and in the verse-close (4, 1) *expelle puellae*; for these 'Wortanklänge' in Lygd., v. Teuffel, *Stud.* (1871), p. 378; in the Ciris, v. Kreunen, *Ci.*, p. 61; in the Dirae, Naeke, p. 325 (esp. Lyd. 26 *tauro Iove digna vel auro*). Tib., I, 8, 16, has *compserit caput*, without the 'jingle.' seu *compsit, comptis*: here we have Ovid's favorite anaphora + chiasmus (v. K. F. Smith *ad loc.*), which he has oftener than all other poets together, as Am. 2, 4, 39 *candida me capiet, capiet me flava puella*; Culex 292 at tu *crudelis, crudelis* tu magis, Orpheu; Priap. 68, 16 *cecinit . . . ad citharam, cithara tensor ipse sua*.

12 *urit, seu nivea candida veste venit* II 5, 38; F. 1, 637; cf. M. 13, 789.

9-12 seu solvit crines, *decet esse . . . seu compsit, est veneranda . . .*, 'if, on the one hand . . . if, on the other.' Here we have *sive . . . sive* connecting complete conditional clauses, each with its own principal verb and its own apodosis. According to Leo (*Seneca* I 94 f.), "hanc constructionem (prosaicam) boni poetae plerique omnes vitavere praeter Ovidium." His statistics are: 1 Paneg., 32 Ov., 2 Prop., 1 Verg., 1 Hor., 0 Cat., Tib. This usage is doubtless drawn from the rhetorical schools with their fondness for divisions. Bürger (*Hermes* XL 333) well speaks of this period (vv. 9-12) as "built with Ovidian technique," and supposes it imitated from Ovid's *Amores*. The favorite Ovidian *decet* or *decebat* is also present. Of many parallels the best is

the one quoted by Bürger from M. 8, 24: seu caput abdiderat cristata casside pennis, | in galea formosus erat; seu sumpserat aere | fulgentem clipeum, clipeum sumpsisse decebat.—To Zingerle (*Ovid* I 101) and to Smith's note *ad loc.*, add Am. 2, 4, 41.

12 On Ovid's extreme fondness ('mania') for contrasts of colors, v. Zingerle, *Kl. philol. Abh.* II 30 f.; Teuffel, *l. l.*, p. 378; Kleem. 39; McCrea, *Ovid's Use of Colour*. ("Studies in honor of H. Drisler"), pp. 180-194; S. G. Owen in Gordon's "English Lit. and the Classics," p. 173: "Of all Roman poets Ov. has the richest eye for colors," etc.

17 *possideatque, *metit quidquid bene *olentibus arvis Med. 91; cf. Copa 35.

17 *possideo 0 Verg., 28 Ov., 2 Prop. *meto 0 Cat., 6 Ov., 1 Prop. Cf. Verg. E. 2, 48 bene *olentis anethi; Prop. 3, 17, 27 bene olentia; Tib. has instead odoratus twice.

19 et quascumque niger rubro de litore gemmas

20 *proximus *Eois *colligit *Indus aquis A. A. 1, 53: litore, v. note: Eois aquis F. 6, 474; P. 2, 5, 50; cf. P. 4, 6, 48: Indus aquis Prop. 4, 3, 10; A. A. 3, 130; T. 5, 3, 24.

19-20 litore gemmas: in Ov. there is an association of the word for 'pearl'—usually concha, here gemma—with the dactyl litorē, thus litore (-a) concha Lydg. 3, 17; Ciris 103; A. A. 2, 519; 3, 124; T. 5, 2, 23; Am. 2, 11, 13 f. (with explanation). rubro de litore, cf. Verg. A. 8, 686 litore rubro.

*proximus with dat., <Lygd. 5, 3>, 29 Ov. In general, Tib., whose style is so simple, has the dat. with adjs., when used without the copula (expressed or understood), only once; the Tib. app. has this dat. twelve times, v. Iber, *De dat. usu Tib.*, Marburg 1888, p. 41. *proximus 77 Ov. *Eous II 2, 16; 4 Verg. app. (Roset. 3. 45); 14 Ov. *colligo Lygd. 2, 19; 43 Ov.: Tib. uses always lego, 'collect' (3 times). *Indus II 2, 15; 10 Ov.

22 et *testudinea Phoebe superbe *lyra, v. note.

23 hoc *sollemne sacrum multos haec sumet in annos F. 5, 33; A. A. 1, 425.

22-23 Phoebus 1 Tib., 18 Tib. app., 10 Verg. app., 34 Ov. For superbus, with abl., v. on IV 4, 2. *testudinea l., imitation of Prop. 4, 6, 32, testudineae l.; v. p. 20 *lyra (Grecism for fides or testudo) 0 Lucr., Cat., Verg., 2 Tib. app., 2 Culex, 46 Ov., 13 Prop., 17 Hor. *sollemnis II 5, 89; 10 Ov.; 0 Cat.; cf. F. 2, 247 festum sollemne (adj.).

IV, 3.

1 parce meo iuveni, seu quis bona *pascua campi

2 seu colis umbrosi *devia montis aper.

1-2 si quis with a verb of the 2d pers. (apostrophe) not in Tib., but

often in Ov., as F. 1, 631 *siquis amas*, *adsiste*; Rem. 613; Am. 1, 7, 2; T. 1, 7, 1. **pascua* 9 Ov.; 1 Pan., v. Ehr. II 46. **devia montis*, Tib. never joins the plural of a neut. adj. with gen. of a subst. (Grecism); his usual formula also is *fatales annos*, not *annos fati* (at times a. *duri f.*), v. Ehr. II 18; I 34 f.; Cartault, *Le Distique él.*, 223. Cf. M. 8, 692 *ardua montis*; 1, 479 *nemorum avia*; 1, 594 n. *secreta*. Cf. also the large use of substantival neuter adjectives in the *Aetna*, such as *imum*, *profundum*, *cava*, *decliva*, to which Herr (*De Aetnae sermone*, Marburg 1911, p. 33) has rightly called attention (58 exx. in all); on the great frequency of the partitive gen. in Ov. after neut. adjs., see Hau, *De casuum usu Ov.*, pp. 135 f. **devius* 9 Ov.

5 sed procul **abducit* **venandi* ***Delia** cura Priap. 76, 6; H. 4, 40; 20, 95; M. 5, 639; F. 5, 537; cf. Cu. 110.

5 **abduco* IV 8, 7; II 3, 61: 12 Ov. **venor* 13 Ov. **Delia* = *Diana*; so **Delius* = *Apollo* 2 Lygd., 6 Ov.; in this use not in Prop. and Cat., but once in Verg. (E. 7, 29), cf. Hor. C. 4, 6, 33 (D. dea). On *Delius* and the ornate mythology of Ov., v. Kleem. 40; also Hansen, *De tropis*, 25. cura with gen. of gerund., 9 Ov., 0 Tib.

7 quis furor est, **quae mens** densos **indagine* colles M. 5, 13.

7 (*quis furor est* Tib. 1, 10, 33; Ov. Am. 3, 14, 7; A. A. 3, 172; M. 6, 170; cf. 3, 531. 641.) **indagine* Verg. A. 4, 121; M. 7, 766; 0 Lucr., Cat., Hor., Prop. (*densus* 1 Tib., 46 Ov., v. Ehr. III 21.) Cf. also Cat. 11, 1 *quaenam te mala mens*.

8 claudentem **teneras laedere** velle manus II 3, 10; F. 4, 120; (Prop. 3, 7, 48): **teneras manus** II 3, 10; F. 4, 774: **teneras manus** IV 6, 2; Am. 1, 13, 18; H. 15, 216; P. 4, 12, 24; not in Tib.

9 quidve iuvat furtim **latebras* **intrare* ferarum M. 1, 593: *latebris ferarum* M. 1, 216; **quid iuvat** II 3, 78; Lygd. 3, 18; 5, 19; Copa 5; Am. 2, 9, 3; 2, 6, 19; 2, 14, 1; 3, 9, 33; H. 11, 17; A. A. 3, 651; Rem. 629; M. 13, 965; P. 4, 9, 40; 4, 16, 51; F. 6, 589.

9 **latebrae* 15 Ov., 5 Lucr., 12 Verg., 1 Hor., 0 Cat., Prop. **intro* 61 Ov., 0 Cat. Instead Tib. always has *quid prodest* (*prosunt*),—5 times, which Ov. also has 12 times.

10 candidaque **hamatis* **crura notare** **rubis* M. I, 508: **hamatis**, cf. M. 2, 799 h. *sentibus*.

10 cf. M. 1, 508 *crura notent sentes*, and note the pairs *sentis rûbus*, *vinum mërurum*, *lectus tõrus*, *ignis fõcus*, the first of each pair being used in the hexameter close, and the second in the pentam. close. **hamatus* 6 Ov., 1 Prop., 5 Lucr., 0 Cat., Verg., Hor. **rubus* Catal. 3*, 8; 3 Ov. *noto* 1 Tib., 4 Tib. app., 66 Ov.

12 **ipsa ego** per montes retia torta feram H. 8, 79; 12, 97, etc.

13 ipsa ego velocis quaeram **vestigia** ***cervi** T. 5, 9, 27:
quaeram vestigia Hal. 78; M. 6, 560.

14 et **demam** celeri ferrea **vincla** cani; M. 3, 168; T. 4, 7, 7;
F. 3, 320; **celeri cani** H. 4, 42; F. 2, 232.

12-14 Cf. IV 6, 16 ill(a) aliud; Tib. has *ips(e) ego* (1, 3, 15; 1, 5, 15), but he never elides a trochaic word ending in -ā before a short vowel, v. Hörschelmann, *Philologus* 1897, p. 360 f., who regards this elision as an evidence of spuriousness: *ipsa ego* is very common, however, in Ov., as H. 8, 77; 12, 97; so also *illa ego* H. 12, 105. Birt (Müller's Handbuch I, 3, München 1913, p. 240, n. 3) notes that the Ovidian *illa ego sum* occurs freely in the *Ciris* (vv. 409, 411, 414), and Ganzenmüller, *Beitr. z. Ciris*, p. 609, cites seven examples of this locution from Ov. **cervus* 18 Ov. Tib. avoids subst. + gen. in hex. close, v. on 3, 2; but such closes are frequent in Ov., Lygd. and the *Culex*, v. Plésent, *Cul.*, p. 353. Instead Tib. has v. solvo (2, 1, 7. 29) and v. detraho (1, 5, 66). *demo* 1 Tib., 73 Ov. On *celer* in Ov. and Tib., v. Zingerle, *Abh.* II 52 f. Acc. to Zingerle (*Ov. u. s. V.* I 73), the carrying of the nets in elegy is one of the severest tests of love, and he cites Tib. 1, 4, 49; 4, 3, 11; H. 5, 17; M. 10, 171 as exx. of simple repetition of the same motif (*retia ferre*). He is mistaken, however, and the difference is far greater than the similarity; for, in each case, the Ov. passage, just as here, (1) gives a much fuller picture of the chase, and (2) describes also the eager pressing forward of the unleashed hounds over the mountain ridge, which Tib. omits entirely, e. g. H. 5, 20 saepe citos egi per iuga longa canes; M. 10, 172 non tenuisse canes (recusat), non per iuga montis iniqui | isse comes; cf. 7, 769. 772; 8, 332.

15 si, **lux mea**, tecum | *arguar ante ipsas *concupuisse
*plagas A. A. 3, 524; T. 3, 3, 52: cf. **mea lux** IV 12, 1; Am. 1, 8, 23; 2, 17, 23.

15-16 *lux mea* 2 Cat., *mea* l. 3 Prop.; Tib. never uses pet names at all; such expressions belong to the colloquial language, and he therefore purposely avoids them. *Lux mea* is here an important evidence of spuriousness; see Bürger, *Hermes* XL (1905), 330 and K. Smith's note *ad loc.* **arguo* 11 Ov., 0 Prop. **concupio* 11 Ov., 1 Tib. (1, 8, 35; inferior MSS. *succumbere*), but acc. to Wisser, *Quaest.* Tib. 18, the passage is spurious and due to the 'editor.' **plaga* 20 Ov., 0 Prop.

17 **inlaesus* abibit, | ne **Veneris** cupidae **gaudia** turbet,
aper Lydia 59; Am. 2, 3, 2; A. A. 2, 459; 3, 805.

17-18 **inlaesus* 3 Ov., 0 Lucr., Cat., Verg., Hor., Prop. **gaudia** V., v. on 3, 13; not in Lucr., Cat., Verg., Prop., Hor.

19 lege Dianae, | **caste** puer, **casta** retia tange **manu** F. 4,
324: **casta manu** F. 4, 260; cf. F. 6, 290; H. 20, 10; 14, 50.

19-20 Cf. Am. 1, 1, 10 lege pharetratae virginis. Cf. F. 4, 324 re

dabis, et *castas casta* sequere manus. This rhetorical repetition of the substantive in a different case is more common in Ov. than in all other poets together, e. g. cum *digno digna* fuisse IV 7, 10: *magnum magni* (-o) Catal. 9, 3; Maecen. 150; M. 3, 60: *nuda nudis* (-os) H. 14, 100; M. 4, 261; F. 2, 287. Cf. also Hansen, *De tropis et figuris Tib.* 30, and Smith on IV 7, 10.

21 et quaecumque meo **furtim subrepi**t amori, | ***incidat** cf. F. 3, 19 (Merkel: *obrepsit*).

23 at **tu *venandi studium** ***concede** parenti Rem. 199; cf. M. 3, 413 (**studio v.**).

24 et celer **in nostros** ipse recurre **sinus** H. 15, 95; Am. 3, 2, 76; cf. 2, 12, 2.

22-4 ***incido** 6 Ov. ***venor** 13 Ov. **studium**, with gen. of. ger., 7 Ov., 0 Tib. ***concedo** 34 Ov. (with acc., 21). H. 15, 95 **inque sinus** relabere *nostros*; 13, 78 **inque pios** . . redire **sinus**; cf. A. A. 2, 458; 3, 34; Rem. 354; M. 4, 596.

IV, 4.

1 huc ades et tenerae **morbos *expelle** puellae F. 4, 763, cf. 3, 827.

1 (*tenera puella* 3 Tib., 14 Ov., cf. also Zingerle, *Abh.* II 50) ***expello** II 3, 14*; 19 Ov. Tib. has the simple *pello* 6 times, twice for *expello* (2, 1, 18, 38); he has *depello* once.

2 huc ades, intonsa Phoebe **superbe** coma. | **crede mihi**, ***propera**, v. note: **crede mihi** 30 times in Ov. (cf. Eschenburg, p. 4), 18 times begins v.: **propera** H. 5, 31; Rem. 93; M. 10, 657; T. 1, 1, 127; F. 6, 233.

2-3 **superbus** with abl., IV 2, 22; 14 Ov., 0 Tib. **crede mihi** 7 Prop.; 0 Cat., Verg., Hor. (*mihi crede* 3 Hor., 1 Priap., 7 Ov.); the phrase is a colloquial one and is an evidence of spuriousness, v. Bürger, *Charites*, 385.

***propero** 2 Pan., 61 Ov.; v. Ehr. II 8, IV 51. Instead Tib. often uses *veni*, and *curre* once (1, 3, 92).

5 **effice ne** ***macies** pallentes occupet ***artus** | neu notet . . membra 4 times, v. note: **effice** 14 times: **occupet artus** M. 3, 40; 5, 632; 14, 757; 15, 166; (Verg. A. 7, 446; 11, 424): **macies** . . **artus** H. 11, 27: **notet membra** Rem. 418.

5 **efficio** 1 Tib., 3 Tib. app., 44 Ov. Impv. **effice** 15 Ov., not in Cat., Verg., Prop., Hor., once in Lucr. (1, 29): **effice ne** A. A. 2, 312; T. 1, 8, 49; P. 1, 3, 45; 4, 12, 41: **effice** (-ite) *ut* T. 5, 5, 57; H. 5, 5, 57; H. 15, 205; A. A. 3, 673: with simple subj. Rem. 31; M. 11, 102; P. 3, 3, 63; F. 3, 683; 6, 380: with acc. H. 12, 82; 14, 54; 19, 155. Tib.

uses *fac* with subj. (1, 3, 54). *efficio*, other forms, with obj. clause, 11 times; not in Cat. Tib., Prop., Hor.; once in Verg. (E. 3, 51), and five times in Lucr. **macies* 10 Ov. **artus* II 3, 9; 68 Ov.; cf. *pallentia membra* H. 11, 77.

8 in **pelagus rapidis* **evehat amnis aquis* Am. 1, 15, 10; 2, 4, 8; 3, 6, 80; Ib. 516.

8 **pelagus* (Grecism) 27 Ov. Tib. loved rather the phrase *placida aqua* (3 times: 1, 4, 12. 7. 14. 2, 78), v. Ehr. II 71, and, on *rapidus*, III 33. **eveho* 4 Ov. (Cf. Tib. 1, 4, 66 *vehet amnis aquas*; 1, 9, 50, *amnis aqua*; A. A. 3, 386 *devehit amnis aqua*; cf. Zingerle, *Abh.* II 84.)

10 quicumque et cantus *corpora fessa levant* M. 10, 176: **c. fessa** IV 11, 2.

12 *votaque pro domina vix numeranda facit* P. 1, 6, 38; cf. 2, 5, 6; Ib. 447.

14 dicit in *aeternos aspera verba deos* II 3, 30; Rem. 688; F. 3, 804; 4, 954; 6, 322: **aspera verba** P. 2, 6, 8. 7, 56.

10-14 Cf. *lassa c.* Rem. 414: *fessa membra* H. 2, 90; 4, 90; M. 4, 215: m. *levat* Moret. 5; F. 6, 328. *aeternus* 1 Tib., 7 Tib. app., 4 V. app., 2 Aetna, 37 Ov.; cf. Ehr. III 18.

15 **pone metum**, Cerinthe: *deus non laedit amantes*. | *tu modo semper ama* 16 times, v. note: **laedit amantes** A. A. 2, 515; Prop. 3, 16, 11: **tu . . semper ama** H. 16, 254: **semper amare** 10 times: **tu modo semper** H. 18, 216: **tu modo** 1 Lygd., 12 Ov. (*vos modo* 5 Ov.), v. Ehr. VII 51, 56.

15-16 *pone metum*—usually as verse beginning—is one of the chief Ov. locutions and refrains (Zingerle, *Ovid* I 34; Ganzenmüller, *Philologus* LXX 291): H. 16, 68; 20, 1; A. A. 1, 556; Rem. 544; M. 3, 634; 5, 226; 14, 110; T. 3, 7, 29; 5, 2, 3; F. 2, 759: also *pone metus* Am. 3, 6, 61. 62 (*Ilia*, p. *metus* . . . *Ilia*, p. *metus*); M. 1, 736; 11, 390; 15, 658; P. 3, 3, 83: also *posito metu* M. 4, 128; F. 1, 101. No form of this loc. is in Lucr., Cat., Verg., Prop., Hor.; Verg. has instead *solve metus* (-m) 4 times (A. 1, 463. 562; 5, 420; 9, 90; cf. Hor. Epod. 9, 37). Lexicons cite Plin. Ep. 5, 6: *ut metum ponas*. *Cerinthe*, so 3, 11 *tecum*, *Cerinthe*; 5, 1 *te*, *Cerinthe*; 5, 5 *Cerinthe*. These poems, as Knappe (p. 16) points out, differ wholly from Tib. in the free use of apostrophe, the favorite figure of Ovid; cf. Ehr. I 29, and v. on 2, 3; 3, 1; II 2, 2. Cf. M. 191 *laesit amores*; H. 7, 59 *laesus amor*; cf. Tib. 1, 9, 1. Ov. has a veritable mania for the verse-closes *semper amare*, *semper amem*: II 3, 69 *semper amarunt*; Dirae 102 *semper amabo*; Catal. 8, 3 *quos semper amavi*; Rem. 7 *ego semper amavi*; Am. 1, 3, 2, 2, 14, 10; H. 15, 80 (*et semper causa est*) *cur ego semper amem*; Rem. 455 s. *amaret*; Am. 2, 13, 12 s. *Osiris amet*; Ib. 419 s. *ametur*; T. 4, 10, 40 s. *amata*; F. 3, 498 s. *amare*; cf. F. 4, 250; T. 2, 382. Tib.

(1, 6, 65) separates *semper* and *amare* by four words. Propertius also has *semper amare* 4 times (1, 16, 47; 13, 52; 2, 22, 18; 3, 20, 30), *semper amor* 3 times. Note that the 6 vs., 15-18, constitute "the poet's dramatic aside to Cerinthus while addressing Apollo" (Smith); cf. also II 2, 10. This rhetorical device never occurs in Tib., but often in Ov. Thus when Cephalus is about to shoot Procris, Ov., *interrupting the narrative, cries out* (A. A. 3, 735 f.): *Quid facis, infelix? non est fera; supprime tela, etc.* When the sailors are on the point of murdering Arion, Ov. exclaims (F. 2, 101 f.): *Quid tibi cum gladio? dubiam rege, navita, puppem, etc.*; so also in the story of Narcissus (M. 3, 432 ff.) he exclaims: *Credule, quid frustra, etc.* This interruption of the elegy or the epos by the poet's own reflections is Alexandrian. Thus Callimachus pauses in the midst of his story of Acontius and Cydippe to rebuke himself. *σχερλῆν*, says Apollonius (3, 1113) giving expression to his own sympathy, and Catullus addresses his heroine in commiseration as *ah misera* (64, 71); see Jackson, *Harvard Studies in Class. Phil.* XXIV (1913), p. 49; Duckett, *Hellenistic Influence on the Aeneid*, Smith College Studies, 1920, p. 13, and *Class. Journal* XI (1916), p. 334.

21 *nil opus est fletu: lacrimis erit aptius uti, si *quando* 12 times: *si quando* Pan. 43; Am. 1, 13, 6; A. A. 2, 15; M. 11, 24, etc.

21 *nil opus est*—often as verse beginning—Am. 1, 2, 21; H. 20, 185; A. A. 1, 137; 2, 162; M. 10, 565; 14, 24; P. 1, 2, 94; 4, 15, 12; F. 4, 813. 926; cf. T. 5, 14, 41 (nihil); P. 3, 1, 113; cf. IV 13, 7 (*nil o. . . est*). Tib. has only *quid opus est* (1, 6, 33).

18 te | *cogitat, et frustra **credula turba** sedet Rem. 685; F. 2, 716; 4, 312.

19 **Phoebe, fave:** laus magna tibi *tribuetur in uno II 5, 1: **laus magna** P. 4, 13, 48; cf. Am. 2, 9, 16.

20 **corpore servato** *restituisset duos Am. 3, 4, 5. 7.

18-20 *cogito IV 5, 10; 1 Priap., 4 Ov. Impv. *fave* 4 Tib. app., 6 Ov. (F. 3, 714 Bacche, fave; 6, 249 Vesta, fave; 4, 1; 1, 468; A. A. 1, 146; Am. 2, 13, 21); not in Tib., who has only *faveat* (2, 1, 1); *favete* also 5 Ov. *tribuo 1 Pan., 4 V. app., 19 Ov., 0 Verg., v. Holtschmidt 60; Tib. has only *contribuo* (once). Cf. H. 11, 60 *nec unius corpore perde duos*; Am. 2, 13, 15 (a poem also on the sickness of the beloved) *et in una parce duobus*; M. 11, 388 *animasque duas ut servet in una*: v. also K. F. Smith *ad loc.* and Zingerle, *Ovid*, I 58 and on 'number contrasts' in Ov., Zingerle, *Abh.* II 32. *restituo 1 Cu., 14 Ov.

24 *certatim sanctis laetus uterque focis.

25 tunc te felicem dicet **pia turba** deorum Cons. Liv. 296; T. 5, 3, 47; F. 2, 507: **turba deorum** Aetna 62; T. 4, 1, 53; F. 2, 667.

26 optabunt artes et sibi **quisque** tuas, v. note.

24-26 **certatim* 3 + Ov., 0 Prop. (*sancti foci* Tib. 1, 2, 82; 1, 8, 70; P. 2, 1, 32; F. 4, 296). *cetera turba* (deorum), Aetna 62: 11 Ov. **quisque* always with sing. vb. in Hor., Prop., Tib. (1, 2, 96; 2, 1, 31, 84), but often with plur. in Ov. (A. A. 1, 109; Am. 3, 2, 18; M. 1, 59, 507; 4, 80; 7, 575; 12, 224; F. 2, 715); correct Smith's note in part. With the plural verb here used, Streifinger, *De syntaxi Tib.*, Wirceburgi, 1881, p. 12, well compares two passages from the Tib. app., namely Lyg. 4, 10 hominum genus . . . placant; Paneg. 186 pecus . . . pascebant.

IV, 5.

2 atque (dies) **inter** festos semper **habendus** erit. | te nascente Am. 1, 11, 2; F. 5, 348; cf. M. 10, 399; P. 4, 9, 35; H. 6, 118: **festus** (-a) **dies** Am. 3, 10, 47; H. 16, 92; M. 6, 435; 10, 270; 12, 150; T. 5, 5, 3, 42; F. 5, 670; 6, 239 (Tib. has only festa lux, 2, 1, 30).

2 **nascens* not in Tib., but often in Ov.: H. 15, 81; T. 4, 3, 46; 5, 3, 14; Ib. 210; P. 1, 8, 63.

6 si tibi de nobis mutuus **ignis** adest cf. Am. 2, 16, 12 (Merkel: **ardor a.**).

7 mutuus adsit amor, per te **dulcissima furta** | perque tuos oculos M. 9, 557: **perque tuos oculos** Am. 3, 11, 48; cf. 3, 3, 14; Lygd. 6, 47.

6-8 Amatory use of *ignis* not in Tib., but often in Verg. and Ov., as Am. 2, 16, 11 meus ignis abest; 3, 9, 56 tuus ignis eram; H. 4, 15, 33; 18, 85; M. 3, 490; 4, 64, 195, 675, etc. (*mutuus amor* Tib. 1, 2, 63; 1, 6, 76; Catal. 4, 12: more often *mutua cura*: 1 Lyg., 4 Ov.)

13 **vel** serviat **aeque* . . **vel** mea vincla leva. | sed potius, v. note: **sed potius** Lygd. 1, 27; M. 9, 599; cf. Ciris 330.

13 *vel* . . . *vel* 0 Tib., 4 Pan., 1 Cu., 1 Ci., 37 Ov., v. Ehr. IV 71. **aeque* IV 12, 1; 3 + Ov. Cf. Verg. A. 2, 146 levare vincla.

16 **nulla** queat **posthac* nos soluisse **dies** T. 3, 3, 18; P. 4, 4, 1; cf. T. 3, 8, 12.

17 optat idem iuvenis quod nos (puellae), sed ***tectius** optat, v. note.

19 at tu, Natalis, **quoniam* deus **omnia sentis**, A. A. 2, 648; T. 5, 4, 37.

20 **adnue*: **quid** ***refert**, clamne palamne roget? H. 6, 137; 16, 211; M. 13, 268; F. 3, 495: **ne** . . . **ne** M. 3, 256, 538; 13, 912; 15, 503; F. 2, 782, etc.

16-20 **posthac* Ciris 510 (A²L); 1 Lucr., 3 Cat., 2 Verg. Cf. A. A. 1,

276 vir male dissimulat. *tectius* illa (puella) *cupit*; for *optat cūpit* as interchangeable, v. on 3, 10.

adj. *tectus*, 'secret,' 0 Tib., 1 Lyg., 16 Ov. Tib. 1, 7, 63 (at tu *natalis* . . *candidior veni*) suggests chiefly *dies natalis* (Némethy), yet even Tib. approaches perhaps the idea of Deus Natalis. The full and pronounced personification, however, such as we find it here, is eminently Ovidian, as T. 3, 13, 2 *ecce supervacuus* . . | *ad sua Natalis tempora noster adest*. | *dure, quid ad miseros veniebas exulis annos?* | *non ultra patriam me sequerere meam*; T. 5, 5, 13; II 2, 1 *venit Natalis ad aras*; ib. 21. **quoniam* 62 Ov.; here in usual Ov. position after *penthem. caes.*, v. Ehr. VI 65. **adnuo* (v. Ehr. IV 14) IV 6, 13; 6 Tib. app.; 33 Ov., 1 Prop.; Tib. has only *renuente* (1, 5, 20). Impv. *adnue* IV 6, 13; III 5, 121; Am. 3, 2, 55; P. 2, 8, 51; F. 1, 15. **refert* 5 Ov., 13 Lucr., 0 Prop.

IV, 6.

1 *turis acervos*, | *quos tibi dat tenera docta puella manu* M. 5, 131: *dat tenera manu* H. 15, 216; cf. P. 4, 12, 24; v. on 3, 8: *docta puella* Lydia 25; A. A. 2, 281.

3 se *laetissima* *compsit*, | *staret ut ante tuos conspicienda focos*, v. note: *ante focos* P. 1, 1, 52; F. 3, 30; 6, 305, v. Ehr. IX 20-22.

1-4 *turis a.*, not in Lucr., Cat., Verg., Prop., Hor. *docta p.* Cat. 35, 16; Prop. 1, 7, 11; 2, 11, 6. 13, 11. *laetissimus* (rare) 4 Verg., 2 Ov. (A. A. 1, 359; M. 8, 570); not in Lucr., Cat., Prop., Hor.; on superl. in 5th ft. in Ov., v. Esch. 16, and cf. *gratissima* IV 1, 8; *dulcissima* 5, 7. *conspiciendus* in close of pentameter 1 Tib., 2 Tib. app. (II 3, 52), 12 Ov.; cf. *diripienda* IV 3, 22; Lygd. 6, 28; *vix numeranda* IV 4, 12; v. Zingerle I 10, Esch. 31.

5 illa quidem ornandi causas tibi, **diva*, **relegat*, v. note.

8 *vincla para*. | *sic bene compones: ullae non ille puellae | servire . . dignior* M. 4, 183: *bene compones* Cons. Liv. 301; A. A. 2, 385; F. 3, 484: *puellae servire* Am. 2, 17, 1.

11 nec possit cupidos *vigilans* **deprendere custos* A. A. 3, 612; cf. M. 12, 148.

14 ter tibi *fit libo*, ter, *dea casta*, mero F. 3, 735.

5-14 *causa* with gen. ger. 0 Tib., 9 Ov. **diva* 24 Ov. **relego* 10 Ov.; 0 Prop. cf. *bene iungere* H. 13, 117; M. 1, 9; 14, 675; Am. 1, 13, 6. **deprendo* 36 Ov.; often, as here, of surprising lovers, e. g. A. A. 3, 717. Cf. F. 3, 735 *liba deo fiunt*, 'are offered.'

16 illa aliud tacita, *iam sua*, mente rogat, M. 14, 166; v. note: *tacita mente* Am. 1, 4, 23; 3, 7, 63; A. A. 1, 602; M. 5, 428; 15, 26; F. 3, 634.

16 Cf. M. 14, 166 *iam suus*, 'now again master of himself'; 8, 35 *vix sua*, 'mistress of herself'; 3, 689 *vixque meum* (me), 'master of myself.' It is unnecessary, with Ném., to cite only Plaut., Pers., and Sen. *tacita m. Cat.* 62, 37, but not in Lucr., Verg., Prop., Hor.

17 *uritur, ut celeres urunt* **altaria flammae*, v. note: *celeris flammae* T. 1, 2, 45.

19 *veniet cum* **proximus annus*, | *hic idem votis iam vetus adsit amor* F. 6, 567; P. 4, 4, 18; (*vetus amor* Rem. 108; cf. H. 16, 255; M. 5, 576; *Ciris* 109,—yet cf. also Tib. 2, 4, 47: *veteres amores*.)

17-20 *uror* and *arsi*, in the love poet, denote the supreme crisis of the action; therefore Ov. often adds an effective simile, (Tib. never), as H. 7, 24 *uror, ut inducto ceratae sulphure taedae*; 15, 9 *uror, ut . . . fertilis accensis messibus ardet ager*; 12, 34, *arsi*, | *ardet ut . . . pinea taeda*; M. 3, 372 *calescit, non aliter quam . . .* Cf. also Washietl, *De similitudinibus imaginibusque Ovidianis*, Vienna 1883. Tib. has *rapida* and *acris fl.* (1, 9, 49; 1, 6, 46). **altaria* 2 Verg. app., 1 *Aetna*, 6 Ov., 3 Lucr., 17 Verg.; not in Cat., Prop., Hor.; its use "shows non-Tibullan origin" (Bürger, *Charites* 385). **proximus* 3 Tib. app., 77 Ov.

IV, 7.

1 **tandem venit amor*, qualem *texisse pudori . . . sit mihi* H. 17, 14; A. A. 1, 720; Rem. 619; M. 4, 191: *pudori* (esse) Am. 3, 14, 21; M. 5, 526; 7, 687.

1 **tandem* 3 Tib. app.; 14 + *Met. pudori est* not in Lucr., Cat., Verg., Prop., but twice in Hor.; on this dat. with *esse* in general in Ov., v. Hau, *De casuum usu* Ov., Monasterii 1884, p. 59.

On this elegy and its non-Tibullan language, see F. Hennig, *op. cit.* 14.

3 **exorata meis illum* **Cytherea*, **Camenis*, Pan. 24, v. note.

3 **exoro* 10 Ov. **Cytherea* 8 Ov. **Camena* 0 Lucr., Cat., 1 Verg., 1 Prop., 3 Tib. app., 2 Catal. 5, 5 Ov.

The striking Ovidianism here is *meae Camenae* = *mea carmina* or *poemata*. This use occurs only in Pan. 24 (*meae C.*), 192 (*nostrae C.*), P. 4, 13, 33 (*non patria scripta C.*), and 6 times in Hor. (*C.* 1, 12, 39; 2, 16, 38; 4, 6, 27. 9, 8; Ep. 1, 1, 1; A. P. 275). In general, the early Augustans rarely use, by metonymy, the name of a *minor* or an *unusual deity* for the object which the god represents. Such excess seemed to them distinctly Alexandrine and akin to affectation; hence, too, the clever parody of Persius (*Sat.* 1, 94 f) includes among the mannerisms of the neoteric school the use of *Nereus* in the sense of 'the sea.' Among the less usual gods Verg. has perhaps only *Titan*,

'sun,' *Minerva*, 'spinning,' *Vesta*, 'hearth,' and *Thetis*, *Nereus* and *Doris*, 'sea,' once each (Ecl. 4, 32; 6, 35; 10, 5); Hor. has only *Camena*, *Musa*, *Lyaeus*, *Liber*, *Phoebus*. Ov., however, uses the rarer names in endless profusion: *Camena*, *Musa*, *Titan*, *Phoebus*, *Phoebe*, *Hyperion*, *Minerva*, *Lyaeus*, *Bromius*, *Nereus*, *Amphitrite*, *Tethys*, *Naias*, *Mulciber* ('fire'), *Pallas* ('oil,' 'olive-tree'), etc. This excessive Ov. use is seen also in the Pan. (v. Ehr. I 40-48 and Hartung 45), in Lyg. (2, 19; 6, 57), in the Culex (101, 373), the Copa (20), the Aetna (14), Lydia (40), and the Moretum (113). (V. further Siebelis-Polle, Register III., s. v. "Götter," Müller, *R. M.*³, p. 154, and Hansen, p. 23. We may note also that, in *Midsummer Night's Dream*, Shakspeare took Titania, Oberon's queen, directly from the Latin text of Ovid, where it is the epithet of the Titan's sister, Diana; v. on 3, 5.

4 attulit in nostrum **deposuitque sinum** F. 2, 404: **deposuitque** F. 2, 756 (postponed **que**).

7 non ego ***signatis** quicquam mandare **tabellis**, | ne legat id nemo Am. 2, 15, 15: **ne nemo**, 'lest any one,' v. note.

9 sed . . **vultus componere** famae | *taedet: cum digno digna fuisse ferar M. 13, 767: **cum d. fuisse**, v. note.

4-10 *depono* 1 Tib., 41 Ov. . **signo* II 5, 14; Pan. 97; 40 Ov., v. Ehr. III 33. Cf. *commisi* (*dedi*) verba *tabellis* M. 9, 586; 14, 707. The double negative, à Grecism, is also in Pan. 164; P. 1, 1, 66; Prop. 2, 19, 32. **taedet* II 5, 93; 1 Ov.; not in Luer., Prop. or Hor. Tib. has *pudet* 9 times, *piget* twice, never *taedet*. This euphemism for *concubuisse* (Varro, L. L. 6, 80) is frequent in Ov.: A. A. 3, 664 *mecum non semel illa fuit*; Am. 2, 8, 27; H. 5, 157; Priap. 14, 3.

IV, 8.

1 ***invisus natalis adest**, qui rure ***molesto** | . . **tristis** agendus erit T. 3, 13, 2; cf. M. 9, 285: **natalis ag. (ac.)** IV 9, 3; M. 2, 497; 8, 242; 13, 753: **tristis ag.** H. 13, 42.

5 iam, ***nimum** Messalla mei ***studiose**, quiescas, v. note.

1-5 ***invisus** 33 Ov. . ***molestus** 5 Cat., 4 Ov. (Cf. *dies natalis* IV 9, 3; A. A. 1, 405. **nimum* Lyg. 6, 21; 45 Ov. . **studiosus* IV 6, 15; 18 Ov., 0 Prop.; on his fondness for adjs. in osus, v. Esch. 25.

7 hic **animum** ***sensusque** meos ***abducta** relinquo M. 14, 178.

8 **arbitrio** quamvis non sinis esse **meo** A. A. 3, 320; F. 6, 98.

7-8 ***sensus** 30 Ov. . ***abduco**, v. on 3, 5. . ***arbitrium** Lyg. 6, 14; 24 Ov.; abl. of quality, as here, 7 times. *quamvis* with indic., Lyg. 6, 29 (hence 2 Tib. app.) and vastly frequent in Ov., v. Kleem. 36, 60; Ehr. VII 8, but not in Tib.

IV, 9.

1 scis **iter** ex animo sublatum **triste** puellae T. 3, 9, 32: **ex animo** cf. Am. 2, 5, 51; A. A. 3, 472.

IV, 10.

1 **gratum est**, securus multum **quod** iam tibi de me | **permittis** H. 16, 13; Cat. 107, 3: **tibi permittis**, cf. note.

5 *solliciti sunt pro nobis, quibus illa dolori est,

6 ne cedam **ignoto**, maxima causa, **toro** Lyg. 6, 60; cf. Am. 2, 11, 7 (notum t.): **maxima causa** Catal. 9, 12; Aetna 399; Rem. 322. 768; T. 5, 12, 46; cf. Am. 2, 6, 10; H. 17, 156: **dolori causa**, v. note.

1-6 Cf. T. 2, 356 (pars operum meorum) *plus sibi permisit* compositore suo; cf. H. 7, 39. *sollicitus 3 Lyg., 45 Ov.

causa dolori is used for *c. doloris* (for the trajection, v. II 3, 14; Am. 3, 5, 14); the latter occurs 11 times in Ov.: Ciris 336 (A); Am. 1, 14, 14; 2, 6, 10; A. A. 3, 599; Rem. 572; 726; M. 1, 736; 13, 748; T. 3, 8, 32; 4, 3, 33; F. 6, 746 (*c. dolendi* occurs 3 times: H. 20, 125; M. 2, 614; 11, 345); on his fondness for *causa* with the gen.—a fondness which begins with Lyg. 2, 30 (*causa perire fuit*)—v. Zingerle I 20, Esch. 20; cf. also Prop. 1, 16, 35 *maxima causa doloris*. Ov. also has *dolori est* 3 times: Am. 3, 9, 57; M. 1, 246; P. 1, 1, 61; v. on 7, 1, and cf. Cat. 96, 5.

IV, 11.

1 estne . . tuae **pia cura** puellae, | **quod** mea nunc *vexat corpora fessa *calor Am. 2, 16, 47; H. 8, 15: **cura puellae** Am. 1, 9, 43; H. 21, 59; A. A. 2, 295; 3, 631; Rem. 205; (Prop. 3, 21, 3): **vexat corpora** T. 5, 2, 5.

3 **a ego** non *aliter tristes *evincere morbos | optarim, quam si . . Lyg. 4, 82: **non aliter quam** M. 3, 373; 4, 122. 348; 6, 516; T. 5, 2, 10; F. 2, 209.

6 tu | nostra potes **lento pectore** ferre mala H. 15, 169.

1-6 *pia* 1 Tib. (piē, 1, 3, 25), 6 Tib. app., 125 Ov. *cura*, with the gen., far exceeds *amor* in Ov., v. on 5, 7. Belling, p. 70, acutely observes: "To his own love Lygdamus, like 'Sulpicia,' applies only the word *cura*." *vexo 2 Ci., 10 Ov. *c. fessa*, v. on 4, 10. *calor 1 Pan., 10 Ov. *aliter 20 + Ov.; 0 Prop. *evincere IV 7, 5; 8 Ov. (*tristes morbi* M. 7, 601; cf. Tib. 1, 5, 9.) (*ferre mala* Tib. 1, 6, 82; Am. 1, 14, 24; M. 1, 669; T. 1, 5, 58; 3, 3, 57. 11, 17; 4, 6, 37; 5, 1, 49; Ib. 120; P. 1, 7, 69; 2, 6, 6.)

IV, 12.

3 si quicquam tota **commisi** stulta *iuenta, v. note.

6 *ardorem cupiens dissimulare **meum** H. 20, 17. 42; 12, 180.

3-6 Tib. has only *admitto* (1, 6, 56) in this sense ('commit a fault'), but Ov. has *committo* 11 times, as Am. 2, 2, 27; H. 14, 59; M. 7, 25, etc. *iuenta 18 Ov. *ardor 11 Ov.

IV, 13

1 **nulla** tuum nobis *subducet **femina** lectum (Cat. 64, 143; 69, 1;) M. 9, 734; 12, 406; T. 3, 7, 29; P. 4, 6, 40; F. 3, 475, etc.; Priap. 18, 2.

2 hoc primum **iuncta** est **foedere** nostra Venus, v. note.

3 **tu mihi sola places**, nec iam te *praeter in urbe Prop. 2, 7, 19; A. A. 1, 42; cf. M. 4, 228: **te praeter** cf. Pan. 5 (**pr. te**).

4 **formosa** est **oculis** ulla puella meis Prop. 4, 4, 32 (v. 1. **famosa**); M. 9, 476.

1-4 *subduco 17 Ov. Cf. M. 7, 403 thalami *foedere iungit*; T. 2, 536 non legitimo f. *iunctus* amor. (*Venerem iungere* Tib. 1, 9, 76; A. A. 2, 679; Rem. 407; Ib. 353.) *praeter (= nisi) 22 Ov., 0 Prop.; v. Ehr. VIII 61. Cf. *oculis gratus* H. 15, 18; P. 4, 15, 17.

5 **atque utinam** posses uni mihi bella videri 23 times in Ov. (cf. Eschenburg, p. 5, who omits 4 exx. from Met.), 20 times begins v.; also Lyg. 5, 27; Ciris 297; Lydia 56.

6 . . sic ego **tutus** ero. | nil opus *invidia est, procul absit gloria vulgi (Prop. 2, 13, 14; 3, 3, 24;) Rem. Am. 144. 650; F. 3, 432; T. 1, 1, 38; cf. 2, 366: **nil opus est**, v. on 4, 21.

8 **qui sapit**, in tacito gaudeat ille sinu Am. 3, 8, 25; Priap. 52, 11; v. on 2, 2.

9 sic ego *secretis possum bene vivere *silvis Rem. 591; M. 7, 75; cf. H. 4, 169.

10 *qua nulla *humano sit via trita pede, v. note: **via ter**. A. A. 1, 52; Rem. 601; cf. P. 2, 7, 44; Prop. 3, 18, 22.

5-10 *atque utinam* 2 Verg., 9 Prop., 0 Cat., Hor. *bellus* 14 Cat., 1 Tib., 1 Lyg. (4, 52), 1 Ov., 2 Hor., 0 Verg., Prop.; cf. the notes of Smith and of Postgate, p. 195. (*bella videri* Tib. 1, 9, 71; *videberis bella* Cat. 8, 16.) *invidia 1 Lyg., 25 Ov. (*procul absit*, cf. Tib. 1, 6, 39; *procul abesse* 7 Ov.) *gloria* v., v. on 3, 2 and 13. Cf. Prop. 2, 25, 30 *in tacito* cohibe gaudia clausa sinu; T. 4, 5, 17 intra tua

pectora gaude; H. 13, 89, 21, 201. A. A. 1, 110 (in) tacito pectore. *secretus 21 Ov. *silva 123 Ov. (*bene vivere* Tib. 1, 3, 35; T. 3, 4, 25; F. 3, 427.) *qua 14 Tib. app., 16 Verg. app., very often in Ov., never (except qualibet 1, 2, 28) in Tib., who uses the paratactic construction and avoids subordinating particles, v. Ehr. VI 3f. By this means he brings about the completion of the thought within the distich, v. Knappe, p. 9. *humanus 1 Cat., 6 Verg., 8 Prop., 1 Lyg., 41 Ov.

11 **tu mihi** curarum requies, tu nocte vel atra Am. 1, 3, 16; H. 3, 52 (bis); 8, 41; 13, 104 (bis); 15, 187 (bis); M. 7, 817, etc., v. note: **curarum requies** P. 3, 3, 7 (with changed order); cf. **curae r.** T. 4, 10, 117; P. 1, 2, 43: **nocte atra** M. 5, 71; cf. 10, 454 (nox a.); H. 14, 78; **vel**, 'even,' v. note.

12 lumen, et **in solis** tu mihi turba **locis** H. 11, 84; F. 4, 514; cf. Am. 3, 6, 50 (loca s.); Rem. 579; M. 7, 819; F. 1, 502; (Lucret. 4, 571. 590; 6, 396).

13 nunc licet e caelo mittatur *amica **Tibullo**, | mittetur frustra, v. note.

15 hoc tibi sancta tuae Iunonis **numina iuro** Ciris 245; H. 13, 159; T. 2, 53; M. 9, 371; cf. 3, 638 (n. iurant); cf. M. 1, 188 (per flumina iuro).

16 quae sola ante alios est mihi magna deos, v. note.

17 **quid facio demens?** heu heu mea *pignora cedo, v. note.

20 hoc peperit misero **garrula lingua** malum Am. 2, 2, 44.

22 nec **fugiam notae** servitium dominae | sed . . . *considam vinctus ad aras, v. note.

11-23 The threefold repetition, *tu mihi . . . , tu . . . , tu mihi*, surpasses Prop. 1, 11, 23 *tu mihi . . . , tu . . . , tu*, and can be paralleled only from Ov., as Am. 1, 3, 16 *tu mihi . . . , tecum . . . , te mihi*; H. 3, 52 *tu . . . , tu . . . , tu mihi . . . , tu mihi*. As a parallel to vv. 9 and 12 and as an example of similar anaphora, Wilhelm (*Rhein. Mus.* LIX 291)—without recognizing the identity of authorship—aptly quotes the words of Cephalus from Met. 7, 817 ff.: *tu mihi magna voluptas, | . . . tu me reficisque fovesque, | tu facis, ut silvas, ut amem loca sola*. Cf. also with vv. 13 and 14 Cephalus' words in Met. 7, 802: *nec me quae caperet, non si Venus ipsa veniret, ulla erat*; similarly, vv. 700 ff., not even the goddess Aurora can make him forget his love for Procris. As a parallel to vv. 17-20 below, Wilhelm very properly quotes Her. 20, 203 ff.: *ei mihi, quod gaudes, et te iuvat ipsa voluntas. | ei mihi, quod sensus sum tibi fassa meos. | ei mihi, lingua labat*.

vel, 'even,' not in Tib., but 2 Pan., 8 Ov., v. Ehr. IV 70, 72. (*e caelo* Tib. 1, 10, 60; IV 2, 2; A. A. 2, 87; M. 13, 853, etc.) *amica, 'mistress,' 'sweetheart' (often in good sense like *domina*) 4 Cat., 0 Verg., 26 Ov., 10 Prop., 6 Hor.

The obtrusion of the writer's name (*Tibullo*), instead of using the pronoun of the first person, is wholly unlike Tib., but is frequent in Cat. and Ov., v. Postgate, *Selections*, p. 197, and Smith on IV 8, 2.

(*per*)numina iuro (verse-close) is not in Lucr., Cat., Verg., Prop., Hor.; cf. also H. 2, 23 iurata numina; 16, 319 iurabo . . numina. (*sola, longe*) ante alios is carefully avoided by Tib. as trite and exaggerated; he has it only once (2, 4, 24), but it occurs 3 times in Tib. app., 4 times in Verg. app., often also in Ov. and Verg., but not in Prop.; v. Ehr. III 45, IX 27. 24. Cf. M. 3, 641 quid facis, o demens; P. 4, 3, 29 quid facis, a demens. Note also Lyg. 6, 27 quid precor a d.; T. 5, 10, 51 quid loquor a d.? demens occurs 3 times in Tib., but never in these short phrases or questions; cf. also Am. 3, 2, 71. A. A. 3, 735 quid facis, infelix? *pignus 51 Ov. The very rare cedo (*alicui*) aliquid is for concedo, but credo, the reading of AV here, may be correct; cf. A. A. 3, 486 pignora nec puero credite. notus 2 Tib., 97 Ov. Postgate needlessly censures notae as 'prosaic,' but cf. Am. 2, 11, 7 ecce fugit notumque torum, and notus amor 4 times in Ov. *consido 14 Ov., cf. F. 6, 305 ante focos considerare. Tib. has always sedeo (4 times).

IV, 14.

1 *rumor ait . . . : | nunc ego me *surdis auribus esse velim Am. 3, 7, 61; P. 2, 9, 25.

3 crimina non haec sunt nostro sine facta dolore: | quid miserum torques?

1-4 *rumor 13 Ov. Prop. 2, 16, 35 surdis auribus esse solet; cf. 2, 20, 13; 2, 16, 18. *surdus 15 Ov. Tib. never postpones sine but it is postponed or placed between adj. and subst. by Ov. 8 times (v. Ehr. IX 16), also Ciris 520. Also to place sine in the fourth thesis of the hex., as here, Ciris 520, Cu. 275, is admitted by Tib. only once (1, 2, 75), but by Ov. in his elegies alone 83 times, v. Esch. 7. (Cf. Tib. 2, 6, 17 me miserum torques; Ciris 257 quid me . . . torques?)

ADDENDA.—The remaining part of the vocabulary may be presented briefly as follows:

NOUNS AND ADJECTIVES.—candida membra (4, 6, acc. to D) M. 2, 607 (A has pallida m., H. 21, 16). (celeber, of a god, 4, 23: Tib. 2, 1, 83; M. 1, 747.) *debita reddere (4, 23) T. 2, 160; F. 4, 894; Prop. 2, 28, 60. *debitus 20 Ov. Decor (2, 8), on Ovid's well-known fondness for personification (allegory) and the extreme rarity of this figure in Tib., v. Ehr. I 38f., Knappe, 13, M. Haupt, *Register zu Met.*, 'Tropen,' Ribbeck, *Röm. Dicht.* II 308 and F. J. Miller, *Class. Journal* XI (1916), 516 ff. *fama (7, 2. 9) 3 Pan., 100 Ov., v. Ehr. II 39. *fervida (cura)

12, 1; 6 Ov. (*ferae saevae* 3, 22: Tib. 1, 10, 6; H. 4, 38; 7, 38; M. 4, 404; 7, 387.) *frigidus* (amnis) 4, 8: cf. Catal. 10, 12 Cremona frigida. (*hesterna nox* 12, 5; Tib. 2, 1, 12; Lyg. 4, 2; H. 19, 72. 193; Prop. 2, 29, 1.) **incolumis* (3, 4) 2 Ciris, 8 Ov. Tib. has *salvus* (1, 5, 19), *tutus* (1, 2, 27) and *intactus* (1, 7, 17). *intonsa coma* 4, 12, cf. *intonsae comae* II 3, 12; cf. H. 11, 116; M. 5, 87. **Kalendae* (2, 1. 21) 1 Lyg., 14 Ov. *laetus eris* 4, 23, cf. *l. ero* T. 4, 2, 72; *laetus*, as here, of a god F. 3, 814; 4, 407. 744. **libens* (5, 9) 3 Ov., 3 Verg. (*libenter* 3 Cat.). *magnus Mars* (2, 1) T. 2, 295, cf. F. 4, 808: *magna (Iuno)* (13, 16) F. 2, 436: also *magnus Genius* (5, 9 acc. to D), where Hiller wrongly reads *mane* with A. So *magnus Iuppiter* occurs in Ov. 18 times, and on the excessive use of *magnus* in the Pan., v. Ehr. III 30. **medicae manus* (4, 4) Verg. G. 3, 455; **medicus* as adj. II 3, 14, 11 Ov., 0 Prop. **necopinans* (9, 4) rare word from Lucr.; used only here—after *qui*—to avoid hiatus, instead of *inopinus* (2 Ov.) **perlucidus* (6, 13) 4 Ov., 0 Prop., cf. **perlucens* (Lyg. 4, 71) 3 Ov. **promissum* (subst.) 7, 5: 16 Ov., 1 Prop. **propinquus* (8, 6) 11 Ov. *purpurea palla* (6, 13) and *Tyria palla* (2, 11), cf. F. 2, 107 Tyrio bis tinctam murice pallam, and p. vestis M. 2, 23; F. 4, 339. Vocs. *sancte* (4, 9; 5, 12) and *sancta* (6, 7) 1 Cat., 2 Verg., 1 Tib., 3 Tib. app., 3 Culex, 2 Priap., 4 Ov. (T. 3, 14, 1; F. 2, 63. 127. 658). **sanus* (6, 18) 19 Ov.; often, as here, 'in one's right mind,' 'heartwhole' Cat. 83, 2; M. 7, 18. 737; 9, 542; F. 4, 7. **tempestivus* (8, 6) 3 Ov., 0 Cat., 0 Prop. (*intempestivus* 7 Ov.) *tristis* (4, 22), 'cross,' 'ill-humored,' not in this sense in Tib., but in Prop. 1, 6, 9; M. 4, 187; 14, 710; cf. H. 3, 90. *valida catena* (5, 15), used for *firma*, cf. *valida compes* Tib. 2, 6, 25, and v. Ehr. III 36 on the excessive use of *v.* in Verg. and Ov. (as *v. labores* Lyg. 4, 65, *v. regnum* Catal. 3, 1). *vellera mollia* (2, 15), cf. M. 6, 21 *vellera molliat*; P. 3, 8, 9 *v. dura*; cf. M. 2, 411 *lanam mollire vellera* *sucis bis madefacta* (2, 16), cf. Culex 62 *Assyrio bis lauta colore vellera*; cf. F. 2, 107 (*bis tinctam*); Hor. C. 2, 16, 35 (*bis tinctae*). **Vertumnus* (2, 13) 2 Ov., 4 Prop. **villa* (8, 3) II 3, 1; 2 Ov., 0 Prop.

ADVERBS, ETC.—**decenter* (2, 14) 2 Ov., 2 Hor., 1 Prop., 0 Lucr., Cat., Verg. *interdum . . . interdum* (4, 13) M. 8,

736, etc. **occulte* (6, 6) 5 Ov., 1 Verg., 0 Lucr., Cat., Hor., Prop. (*o pereant* [3, 6], as Tib. 1, 1, 51; 2, 4, 27. Ov., like Prop., prefers *a pereant*,—4 times, as also Lyg. 4, 62; Copa 34; v. Kleem. 31, Zingerle I 130.) *de litore* (2, 19) Am. 2, 11, 43. *ex oculis* (2, 5) M. 8, 356; 9, 390; T. 1, 3, 4; F. 3, 590; 5, 733. *in feras* (3, 22) M. 15, 168. *in proelia* (3, 3) M. 13, 82; 14, 545.

VERBS.—*calere* (5, 10), used of love, not in Tib., but 6 times in Ov. (*incalescere* 5 times). **divellere* (amantes) 6, 7; 7 Ov., 0 Prop. **exsolvere* (promissa) 7, 5; 1 Ov. (F. 4, 534) 0 Hor., Prop. **exurere* (divos) 2, 5; 2 app. Tib., 3 Ov. **favere votis* (5, 9) T. 4, 2, 55 (for the more usual v. *adesse* or *adnuere*). *habere gaudia* (7, 6) H. 15, 126. **metuere* (fata) 4, 11; 54 Ov.; Tib. uses *timere* instead 8 times. Caesar also avoids *metuere*, v. Bürger, *Charites* 386. *notare* (iniustos) 13, 23; in this sense ('censure') not in Tib., but in T. 2, 7; cf. 2, 466; H. 9, 20. *nudare* (amorem) 7, 2; not in Tib. in this sense ('disclose'), but in Am. 2, 5, 5 and Ci. 422; cf. Ehr. IV 48, and Hennig, *Untersuchungen zu Tib.* 14. "Tibullus uses few tropical expressions" (Bürger, *Charites* 389, after Dissen, *Praef. CLXXVII*). **praecipere* (6, 15) 17 Ov. **procedere* (2, 11) 13 Ov. (4, 5, 11 si *alios iam nunc suspiret amores* Tib. 1, 6, 35; cf. Lydia 3 nostrum *suspirat amorem*.) **vovere* (4, 13) 3 Tib. app., 24 Ov., 0 Prop.

Tibullan corpus II, 2.

1 **dicamus bona verba:** venit Natalis ad aras F. 1, 72; cf. T. 5, 5, 6: **bona verba** T. 3, 13, 24; P. 3, 4, 47; F. 2, 638; not in Tib.: **venit ad aras** H. 21, 157; M. 11, 579; P. 3, 4, 81.

2 **quisquis ades, lingua, vir** *mulierque, **fave** M. 15, 677: **quisquis ades, fave** Ib. 98: **quisquis ades** F. 3, 417; cf. Am. 1, 7, 2: **lingua fave** Am. 3, 2, 43; T. 5, 5, 5; F. 1, 72; 2, 654.

3 **urantur pia tura focis, . .** | quos tener e terra divite mittit *Arabs F. 1, 452; Nux 178: **pia tura focis** H. 7, 24; cf. H. 14, 26 (impia t. f.): **pia tura** Am. 3, 3, 33; H. 21, 7; M. 11, 577; T. 2, 59.

5 . . . adsit **visu^srus** honores, | cui *decorent sanctas mollia sarta comas F. 4, 713; M. 6, 476; 9, 461; cf. 9, 232: **mollia sarta comas** F. 5, 340.

7 . . . *destillent **tempora** *nardo, | atque satur . . made-atque mero Lyg. 3, 6.

1-8 *Natalis*, v. on IV 5, 19. Cf. *ad tua sacra veni* II 5, 6; A. A. 3, 616; F. 6, 250; cf. 4, 451. Tib. (2, 1, 1) restricts apostrophe and has only the less forceful third person, *quisquis adest*, (faveat), so also M. 4, 598; 12, 176; 15, 680. **mulier* 1 Ciris, 4 Ov., 1 Verg.; Tib. has instead *femina* 4 times. Cf. *vir et mulier* Rem. 659; *femina virque* 9 Ov. (as Am. 1, 10, 36; M. 6, 314; T. 1, 3, 23; 2, 6, etc.). Tib. has only *seu vir seu f.* (1, 2, 33). For *pius*, v. on IV 11, 1. **Arabs* 3 Tib. app., 3 Ov.; cf. IV 2, 18 *cultor odoratae dives A. segetis*; Lyg. 2, 24 *Eoique A.*; Cat. 11, 5 *Arabes molles*. The future ptcp. to express purpose is very common in Ov.; there is only one ex. in Tib. (1, 10, 46), see the exx. of the fut. ptcp. collected by Streifinger, *De syntaxi Tib.* 34. **decoro* 1 Ci., 1 Cu., 4 Ov., 1 Cat., 3 Verg., 5 Hor., 0 Lucr., Prop.; Tib. uses *ornare* twice (1, 8, 11; 2, 1, 54). (*mollia sarta* Verg. A. 7, 488; Tib. 1, 7, 52; Prop. 3, 1, 19. *sarta coma* (verse-close) Tib. 1, 3, 66; 1, 10, 22, v. Knappe 38.) **destillo* Verg. G. 3, 281; more common is *stillo* (8 Ov., 2 Tib., 1 Hor., 1 Prop.). **nardus* (Grecism) 1 Lyg., 2 Ov., 1 Lucr., 5 Hor., 1 Prop. *atque* before consonants: only once in Tib. (1, 7, 27), but often in Tib. app. (II 5, 73; Lyg. 4, 72; Pan. 146. 153), and in *Hal.*, *Met.*, *Trist.*, etc.; only once (A. A. 2, 91) in the more polished works, v. Kleem. 32; Ehrlich, *De Tib. elocutione* 36. *madere* alone in Tib. (2, 1, 30) in this sense, but with abl. (Baccho), as here, Lyg. 6, 5; cf. II 5, 87 and A. A. 3, 765.

9 **adnuat* . . . | en age, **quid cessas?** **adnuat ille: roga* F. 6, 675.

11 **auguror*, . . **fidus optabis amores:** | iam **reor* hoc **edidicisse deos* H. 2, 21: **reor . . edidicisse** P. 3, 7, 4.

15 nec tibi . . **quidquid felicibus** **Indis* | **nascitur**, **Eoi* **qua maris unda rubet* P. 4, 3, 54: **unda rubet** M. 11, 375.

9-16 **adnuo*, v. on IV 5, 20. *quodcu^mque* rogabis, also v. 13 *quacu^mque* per orbem, and 4, 4, 9 *quicu^mque* saporis: note *cumque* in the 5. ft., the favorite position of the youthful Ov. (Lyg. 3, 27; 5, 21; 6, 43), but only twice in all Tib., v. Zingerle *Abh.* II 61. *en* 1 Tib., but often in Ov.; *en age* Prop. 1, 1, 21; Verg. G. 3, 42, v. Köhler, *Archiv f. lat. Lex.* VI 25. **quid cessas?** Verg. A. 11, 389; cf. Hor. 3, 27, 58. *cessas?* Lyg. 6, 57; Verg. A. 6, 51; Hor. S. 2, 3, 155. **auguror* 10 Ov., 1 Verg., 1 Prop., 0 Lucr., Cat., Hor. (paratactic use, as here, A. A. 1, 205). **reor* 31 Ov., 19 Lucr., 16 Verg., 4 Prop., 1 Cat., 1 Hor. The word is archaic (Bürger, *Charites* 387); Tib. is fond of *credo* (as 1, 8, 66), and has *putare* also twice. **edisco* 8 Ov., 1 Verg., 3 Hor., 1 Prop. (edidicisse 3 Ov.). V. 13 *totum . . per orbem* Cons. ad Liv. 373; *per orbem* Pan. 50; Ci. 16; Catal. 9, 57; 4 Ov. *totus orbis* 15 Ov. *orbis*, in sense of 'world,' is not in Tib. On the correspondence between II 15 f. and IV 2, 19 f., v. Némethy, p. 329. On **Indus* and **Eous*, v. on IV 2, 20; on **qua*, v. on IV 13, 10. *rubeo* 2 Lyg.; 6 Verg. app.; 27 Ov.; Tib. 2, 1, 55—a spurious passage, acc. to Wisser, *Quaest. Tib.* 2.

17 . . . *strepitantibus *advolet alis | flavaque *coniugio vincula portet Amor A. A. 2, 19; M. 1, 264; M. 14, 507; T. 2, 171.

19 vincula, quae maneant semper, dum tarda senectus P. 4, 8, 9 f.: **tarda senectus** T. 4, 8, 23.

20 inducat *rugas inficiatque comas Tib. 4, 8, 2; cf. Zingerle, *Ovid* I 47.

21 <hac> veniat Natalis <avi> | ludat et ante tuos turba *novella pedes M. 6, 433.

17-22 *strepito (very rare) II 5, 73; Copa 12; Cons. ad Liv. 183; 1 Verg. (G. 1, 413). *advolo 3 Ov., 4 Verg., 0 Cat., Hor., Prop. Cf. M. 14, 507 *plausis circumvolat alis*; Hor. S. 2, 1, 58 *atris circumvolat alis*. Cf. Ci. 317 *Corycio flammea luto*; M. 10, 1 *Hymenaeus croceo velatus amictu*. *coniugium 2 Lyg., 1 Ci., 20 Ov., 4 Cat., 11 Verg., 5 Prop., 0 Hor.; Lyg. 4, 74, as here, = 'wife.' Tib. has only syncope *vincla* (6 times), as he has only *seu* and *sic* (not *ita*). Conduplicatio (with *vincula* repeated) is much more common in Tib. app. than in Tib., v. Hansen 29 f., 34. Tib. (1, 10, 40) has *pigra senecta*. *ruga 16 Ov., 1 Verg., 3 Hor., 5 Prop., 0 Cat. Cf. M. 6, 433 *hac ave coniuncti Progne Tereusque*. The full meaning 'omen' scarcely appears in Tib. 1, 3, 17, but is common in Ov. (M. 15, 640; H. 2, 115, etc.). (ante pedes Tib. 1, 10, 16; often in Ov., v. Ehr. IX 26, 22.) *novellus 5 Ov. (A. A. 1, 118; 2, 698; 3, 560; P. 3, 7, 16; 4, 12, 24), 1 Lucr., 1 Verg., 0 Cat., Hor., Prop. Tibullus scarcely ever uses diminutives, v. Ehr. III 3; Zingerle, *Ovid* I 129; Bürger, *Charites* 382. He has only one diminutive adj., *bellus* (1, 9, 71) and three diminutive substantives (*tabella*, *fabella*, *tigillum*), according to Ehrlich, *De Tib. elocutione*, Halle 1880, pp. 28, 20. *Tigillum* (2, 1, 39) occurs in a passage rejected by Wisser, *Quaest.* 6.¹⁴

¹⁴Since the completion of my own study, Ganzenmüller's genial and delightful booklet, *Die Elegie Nua und ihr Verfasser*, Tübingen 1910, has come into my hands. It is needless to say that Ganzenmüller makes many valuable contributions to our knowledge of Ovidian language, and I wish to add the following references to his admirable discussion and notes: Upon paronomasia (IV 2, 10) and upon apostrophe (IV 2, 3; 4, 15), see pp. 35 ff.; upon *violente* (2, 3), see v. 136 (*improbe*); upon *bella videri* (13, 5), v. 23 (*formosa videri*); upon *si *sapis*, &. (2, 2), v. 53; upon *nostra mala* (11, 6), v. 96; upon **hamati *rubi*, &. (3, 10), vv. 113-115; upon **incolumis* as verse-beginning (3, 4), v. 144; upon *iam licet esse* (9, 2), v. 148 (*non licet esse*). Excellent too is the discussion (pp. 63 ff.)—after Pokrowskij—of the large role which the Roman law and the juristic language play in the poems of Ovid. We should add here the following material from the Sulpicia poems: **arguo* (IV 3, 16: 11 Ov.); **relego* (6, 5: 10 Ov.); *iam sua* (6, 16),

The utter neglect which has befallen the serious studies of Kleemann, Ehrenguber and Holtschmidt has shown me very clearly the need of summarizing my results and placing them in a form that will admit of rapid examination and review by the reader. The summary is presented under several heads.

I. The following is a (partial) list of the words, idioms and phrases occurring in these elegies, *which are found also in Ovid, but are not found either in Tibullus or in Propertius*:⁷⁵

'her own mistress,' = *sui iuris*; **arbitrio* . . . *esse meo* (8, 8: 1 Lyg., 24 Ov.); *mea pignora cedo* (13, 17: 51 Ov.); *notat iniustos* (13, 24), 'marks or brands with infamy' (cf. *nota censoria*). The same juristic atmosphere often makes itself felt also in the Verg. App., as *Ci. 15 sapientia . . . quattuor antiquis heredibus est data consors* (*consors* 16 Ov.); *Catal. 11, 4 quid immeriti crimen habent cyathi?* (c. *habere* 11 Ov.); *Aetn. 40 turpe est sine pignore carmen*, 'a dishonoring tale that has no voucher' (Ellis); 518 certo . . . *pignore*, 'by a trustworthy voucher'; 399 *molaris lapis . . vindicat Aetnam*, 'the lava-stone claims Aetna as its own' ('ihm gehört recht eigentlich der Aetna,' Sudhaus), &.—The excessive use, however, of *focus* in pentameter closes, which is noted by Ganzenmüller, p. 59, belongs to Ov., not to Tib.; the genuine Tib. has only 3 such closes (not 8!), while the Tib. App. has 6. Our author shows very aptly too (p. 24) that Ovid was himself fully conscious of the distinctive style which he had developed, the unmistakable "*color*" which attaches to all his works: cf. T. 1, 1, 61 ut *titulo careas, ipso noscere colore*; P. 4, 13, 3 ff. *color hic tibi protinus index | Et structura mei carminis esse potest . . . | Qualis enim cumque est, non latet esse meum*; *ibid. 13 et mea Musa potest proprio deprensa colore*, &. Finally the careful study (pp. 19 ff.) of the principal elements both of strength and of weakness in our poet shows a clear and independent judgment, and is singularly free from the mere parrotlike repetition and the conventional trivialities which, in the case of some imitative critics, might well remind us of the worst examples of Ovid's own youthful plagiarisms.

In the foregoing study *geminus* (2, 6), which did not occur at all in Tib., was quoted 83 times from Ovid. The question arises how often it should have occurred in Tib., if it had belonged to the latter's vocabulary. Since there are 1006 verses in the genuine Tib. and at least 34,000 verses in Ovid, it is clear that *geminus* should have been employed two or three times. Similarly *properare* (4, 2) should have occurred twice, *quoniam* (5, 19) twice, *atque utinam* (13, 5) once, *adnuere* (5, 20) once, etc. Also either *effice* (4, 5) or *pone metum* (4, 15) should have been used once.

⁷⁵ Many of these are found in almost no other Roman poet (at the most, in one other only), as *pone metum*, *effice*, *indago*, *inlaesus*, *Camenae* ('poems'), *numina iuro* (13, 15), *occulte* (6, 6), etc.; often

IV 2 sqq.—*Pone metum* (IV 4, 15), *effice* (4, 5), *violente* (2, 3), *iam suus* (6, 16), *tacita mente* (ib.), *Camenae* ('poems') (7, 3), *spectatum* (2, 2), *subsequiturque* (*subsequor* : ib. 8), *lampas* (6), *accendit geminas lampadas* (6), *fusis capillis* (9), *niger Indus* (19), *litore gemma* (or *concha* : 19), *multos in annos* (23),⁷⁶—*Delia* (3, 5), *quae mens* (ib. 7), *indago* (7), *latebrae* (9), *latebras intrare ferarum* (9), *crura notare* (10), *vestigia quaerere* (13), *vestigia cervi* (13), *celer canis* (14), *demere vincla* (14), *arguo* (15), *plaga* (16), *inlaesus* (17), *Veneris gaudia* (18), *furtim subrepere* (21), *venandi studium* (23), *in nostros sinus* (24),—*morbos pellere* (4, 1), *occupare artus* (5), *macies artus* (5), *rapidae aquae* (8), *corpora levare* (10), *aeterni dei* (14), *aspera verba* (14), *tu . . . semper ama* (16), *laus magna* (19), *nil opus est* (21), *credula turba* (18), *Phoebe, fave* (19), *corpus servare* (20), *certatim* (24), *turba deorum* (25), *quisque* with plural vb. (26),—*ignis adest* (5, 6), *perque tuos oculos* (8), *tecte adv.* (17), personification of *Natalis* (19), *omnia sentire* (19), *quid refert* (20),—*turis acervos* (6, 1), *laetissimus* (3; cf. Esch. 16), *relegare* (5), *bene componere* (9), *vigilans custos* (11), simile used after *uror* (17), *celeres flammae* (17), *altaria* (17),—*pudori esse* (7, 1), *vultus componere* (9), *taedet* (10),—*natalem agere* (8, 2), *studiosus* (5), *animus sensusque* (7),—*gratum est quod . . .* (10, 1),—*pia cura* (11, 1), *vezare corpus* (2), *non aliter quam* (3), *lentum pectus* (6),—*iungere foedere* (13, 2), *praeter* (3), *secretae silvae* (9), *curarum requies* (11), *nox atra* (11), *sola loca* (12), *numina iuro* (15), *quid facio demens* (17), *garrula lingua* (20).

Addenda (see p. 248).—*Candida* (or *pallida*) *membra* (IV 4, 6), *debita reddere* (4, 23), *magnus Mars* (2, 1), *medicus* as adj. (4, 4), *perlucidus* (6, 13), *tempestivus* (8, 6), *villa* (8, 3), *occulte* (6, 6), *divello* (6, 7) *exsolvo* (7, 5), *favere votis* (5, 9), *gaudia habere* (7, 6), *voveo* (4, 13).

II 2.—*Bona verba* (*dicere*) (1), *venire ad aras* (1), *quisquis ades* (2), *lingua favere* (2), *pia tura* (3), *decoro* (4), *mollia sarta comas* (6), *tempora nardo* (7), *quid cessas* (10), *fidus*

they belong among Ovid's most frequently repeated locutions. I have placed first some of the most striking.

⁷⁶ Prop. has only *m. annos* (2, 8, 13; 3, 22, 1).

amor (11), *reor edidicisse* (12), *quidquid nascitur* (15), *unda rubet* (16), *strepito* (17), *advolo* (17), (ad-) *volat alis* (17), *vincula, quae maneat semper* (19), *tarda senect(us)* (19), *infici(a)t comas* (20), <*hac avi*> (21), *novellus* (22).

Among the numerous non-Tibullan words which closely bind the Sulpicia elegies to the Lygdamus poems, we may note **Delius* or **Delia* (see on IV 3, 5), **geminus* (on 2, 6), **arbitrium* (8, 8), **lyra* (2, 22), **proximus* (2, 20; 6, 19), **colligo* (2, 20), **ignotus torus* (10, 6), **sed potius* (5, 15), &c. Non-Tibullan words that are common to the elegies and the *Panegyric* are **Camena*, 'poem' (see on 7, 3), **pascua* (3, 1), **geminus* (2, 6), **calor* (11, 2), **fama* (7, 2), **adnuo* (5, 20; 6, 13), **qua* (13, 10), **vel*, 'even' (13, 11), &c. The elegies are linked also with II 2 by **Eous* (2, 20), **adnuo*, **qua*, &c., and with II 5 by **diva* (6, 5), **sollemnis* (2, 23), **concubitus* or **concumbere* (3, 16), **adnuo*, **qua*, &c.

II. The following is a list of the words and phrases occurring in these elegies, which are found also both in Ovid and in Propertius, but are not found in Tibullus:

IV 2 sqq.—*Si sapis* (2, 2), *turpiter* (4), *accendo* (6), *geminus* (6), *vestigia* (7), *possideo* (17), *bene olens* (17), *meto* (17), *Eoa aqua* (20), *Indus aquis* (20), *colligo* (20), *proximus* (20), *testudineus* (22), *lyra* (22), *sollemnis* (23),—*pascua* (3, 1), *devius* (2), *abduco* (5), *venor* (5), *teneras laedere* . . . *manus* (8), *intro* (9), *quid iuvat* (9), *hamatus* (10), *rubus* (10), *lux mea* (15; cf. Bürger, *Hermes* XL 332), *concumbo* (15), *incido* (22), *concedo* (23),—*expello* (4, 1), *superbus* with abl. (2), *crede mihi* (3; cf. Esch. 4), *propero* (3), *macies* (5), *artus* (5), *pelagus* (8), *eveho* (8), *vota facere* (12), *laed(i)t amantes* (15), *semper amare* (16), *si quando* (22), *cogito* (18), *tribuo* (19), *restituo* (20), *pia turba* (25),—*festus dies* (5, 2), *nascens* (2), *dulcia furta* (7), *vel . . . vel* (13), *aeque* (13), *sed potius* (15), *nulla dies* (16), *quoniam* (19), *adnuo* (20),—*docta puella* (6, 2), *ante focos* (4), *diva* (5), *vincla parare* (8), *deprendere* (11),—*tandem* (7, 1), *exoro* (3), *Cytherea* (3), *signare tabellas* (7), double negative (8),—*invisus* (8, 1), *molestus* (1), *nimium* (5), *sensus* (7), *arbitrium* (8), *quamvis* with indic. (8),—*sollicitus* (10, 5), *maxima causa* (6; cf. Esch. 20),—*cura puellae* (11, 1), *calor* (2), *evinco*

(3),—*iuventia* (12, 3), *ardor* (6),—*nulla femina* (13, 1), *subduco* (1), *tu mihi sola places* (3), *formosa oculis* (4), *atque utinam* (5; cf. Esch. 5), *tutus ero* (6), *invidia* (7), *secretus* (9), *silva* (9), *qua* (adv., 10), *humanus* (10), *viam terere* (10), *vel*, 'even' (11), *amica* (13), *pignus* (17), *consido* (23),—*rumor* (14, 1), *surdis auribus* (2).

Addenda (see p. 248).—*Fama* (IV 7, 2 and 9), *fervidus* (12, 1), *incolumis* (3, 4), *Kalendae* (2, 1), *libens* (5, 9), *promissum* (7, 5), *propinquus* (8, 6), *sanus* (6, 18), *tristis* ('cross,' 4, 22), *Vertumnus* (2, 13), *decenter* (2, 14), *exuro* (2, 5), *metuo* (4, 11), *praecipio* (6, 15), *procedo* (2, 11).

II 2.—*Mulier* (2), *urere focus* (3), *Arabs* (4), *visurus* (5), *nardus* (7), *adnuo* (9), *auguror* (11), *reor* (12), *Indus* (15), *Eous* (16), *qua* (adv., 16), *coniugium* (18), *ruga* (20).

III. Special Uses:

References have been given above in the text to the Ovidian tests of Zingerle and Eschenburg, which include *crede mihi* (IV 4, 3), *atque utinam* (13, 5), *causa* (10, 6), *sine* (14, 3), adjs. in *-osus* (8, 5), superlatives in 5th ft. (6, 3), *conspiciendus*, &c. (6, 4); to these add *precor* (Esch. 6), *caveto*, &c. (Esch. 18).

On apostrophe, see on IV 2, 3 and 4, 15; on play upon words (paronomasia), on 2, 10; on anaphora + chiasmus, 2, 10; on contrast of colors, 2, 12; substantival neuter adjs., 3, 2; trochaic elision, 3, 12; subst. + gen. in hex. close, 3, 13; the 'unleashed hounds,' 3, 14; rhetorical repetition in a different case, 3, 20; the 'dramatic aside,' 4, 15-18; 'number contrasts' and the identification of the lover with the beloved, 4, 19 f.; use of minor deities for objects represented, 7, 3; use of the writer's name, 13, 13; the formula *ante alios* (13, 16), fondness for personification (2, 8), *atque* before consonants (II 2, 8), *cumque* in 5th ft. (ib. 9); Grecisms (IV 2, 6; 2, 22; 3, 2; 4, 8; 7, 8; II 2, 7); various verse-closes (IV 2, 20; 13, 15; II 2, 7); the dative with adjs. (IV 2, 20); *sive . . . sive* connecting complete conditional clauses, each with its own apodosis (IV 2, 9-12).

The following words occur also in these poems in a sense which is frequent in Ovid but foreign to Tibullus: *vestigium* (IV 2, 7), *compono* (2, 8), *ignis* (5, 6), *committo* (12, 3), *coniugium* (II 2, 18), and—included under the Addenda (p.

248)—*tristis* (IV 4, 22), *caleo* (5, 10), *noto* (13, 23), *nudo* (7, 2).

It is evident that in their language these elegies are really much nearer to Propertius than to Tibullus, and if list II stood alone, we should unhesitatingly ascribe them either to that poet or to Ovid rather than to Tibullus. Lists I and III, together with the evidence of the schemata, show clearly, however, that Ovid is the true author and that practically all the Ovidianisms that can be crowded into so small a space are present in these poems. In general, it seems no more possible permanently to rob Ovid of his various youthful productions, which add so much to our knowledge both of his life and of the development of his art, than it would be to filch away both *Venus and Adonis* and the *Sonnets* from Shakspeare.

IV. Phrases Borrowed from Other Poets:

The poet of the elegies was evidently a lover both of Catullus and of Vergil as well as of Lucretius. Thus *docta puella* (IV 6, 2) comes from Cat. 35, 16 and from Prop. 1, 7, 11, &c.; *sana* (6, 18), 'heartwhole,' from Cat. 83, 2; *tacita mente* (6, 16) from Cat. 62, 37; *scortum* (10, 4), which is not in Propertius, from Cat. 6, 5 and 10, 3; *mea lux* (12, 1 and 3, 15) from Cat. (68, 132. 160) and from Prop.; *nulla femina* (13, 1) from Cat. 64, 143 and Prop. 2, 25, 22; *bella videri* (13, 5) from Cat. 8, 16 and Tib. 1, 9, 71; *Venus sancta* (13, 23) from Cat. 36, 3 and 68, 5; ⁷⁷*tener Arabs* (II 2, 4) from Cat. 11, 5 (*Arabes molles*) and Verg. G. 1, 57 (*molles Sabaei*); the use of the proper name instead of the pronoun (IV 13, 13 *Tibullo*; 8, 2 *Cerintho*) also comes from Catullus and Propertius, see Postgate, *Journal of Philology* IX 281 and *Selections*, 197, and K. F. Smith's note on 8, 2. *Bene olens* (2, 17) is drawn from Verg. E. 2, 48; *rubro de litore* (2, 19) from A. 8, 686 (*et litore rubro*) and Lyg. 3, 17; *indagine claudens* (3, 7) from A. 4, 121 (*indagine cingunt*); *medicae manus* (4, 4) from G. 3, 455; *destillo* (II 2, 7) from G. 3, 281; *molliā sēta* (II 2, 6) from Verg., Tib. and Prop.; *en age* (II 2, 9) from G. 3, 42 and Prop. 1, 1, 21. *Efficere* with obj. clause (IV 4, 5) is taken from Lucr., as also

⁷⁷ So also *sancte puer* in the well-known verses of the *Culex* (26. 37) is an imitation of Cat. 64, 95, where it is a designation of Cupid.

necopinans (9, 4) and *loca sola* (13, 12).—*Corpora fessa levant* (4, 10) perhaps comes from Hor. C. S. 63 (*levat . . . fessos | Corporis artus*).⁷⁸—The imitations both of Tibullus and of Propertius are of course very numerous; they have been collected especially by Zingerle, *Abh.* II 80-86, Knappe, *op. cit.* 37 f., Cartault, *Tibulle* 115, and Belling, *Albius Tibullus*, 74-83, 365, 372 ff., 376.⁷⁹ As Bürger (*Hermes* XL 333) well observes,

⁷⁸ *Additions to Borrowed Phrases.*—The treatment of borrowed phrases given above is incomplete and fails to show the prodigious memory possessed by Ovid, which enabled him easily to be—like Raphael or like Shakspeare—the assiduous ‘ape’ of all his chief predecessors. Thus *mollia vellera* (2, 15) also comes from Cat. 64, 318; *rapidae aquae* (4, 8) from Cat. 70, 4 (*rapida aqua*); *fidi amores* (II 2, 11) from Cat. 64, 182 (*fido amore*); compare also 6, 11 (*vigilans custos*) with Cat. 62, 33 (*vigilat custodia*). Similarly *comptae comae* (2, 10) is drawn from Verg. A. 6, 48; *duri dentes* from G. 2, 379 and Lucr. 5, 1064; *velox cervus* (3, 13) from A. 5, 253; *occupet artus* (4, 5) from A. 7, 446 and 11, 424; *corpora fessa* (4, 10) from A. 4, 522 (cf. Cat. 64, 189 and Lucr. 4, 848); *si quando* (4, 22) from Verg. and Prop. (once also in Cat.); *festi dies* (5, 2) from G. 1, 268 and Cat. 64, 388 (also Lucr., Hor., Prop.); *dulcissima furta* (5, 7) from G. 4, 345 (*dulcia furta*) and Prop. 2, 30, 28; *ante focos* (6, 4) from E. 5, 70 (*ante focum*) and Prop. 2, 19, 14; *animum sensusque* (8, 10) perhaps from A. 4, 24 (*inflexit sensus, animumque labantem Impulit*); *tristes morbi* (11, 3) from G. 4, 252 (*tristi morbo*); *sancta numina* (13, 15) from Lucr. 2, 434 and 6, 70 (cf. 5, 309), and from A. 3, 543 (cf. 8, 382); *nox atra* (13, 11) from A. 1, 89, 2, 360, & (cf. Hor. *Ep.* 10. 9); *terra dives* (II 2, 4) perhaps from A. 4, 37 (*t. triumphis dives*); *tarda senectus* (II 2, 19) from A. 9, 610 and 8, 508. Also *vestigia quaerere* (3, 13) is derived from Lucr. 4, 705. Among the adjectival phrases which occur in no other poets of the Golden Age except [Tib.] IV and Ovid may be named *geminae lampades* (2, 6), *casta manus* (3, 19), *aeterni dei* (4, 14), *aspera verba* (4, 14), *credula turba* (4, 18), *turis acervi* (6, 1), *pia cura* (11, 1), *lentum pectus* (11, 6), *secretae silvae* (13, 9), *garrula lingua* (13, 20), *pia tura* (II 2, 3), & cf. also *iungere foedere* (13, 2), &. Phrases which are found besides only in Prop. are *Eoae aquae* (2, 20), *pia turba* (4, 25), *signatae tabellae* (7, 7), *maxima causa* (10, 6), *via trita* (13, 10), *surdae aures* (14, 2), &. To exx. of *multos in annos* (2, 23) add *Maecenas* 117, and to the verse-close *bella videri* (13, 5) add Ov. exx. of *formosa videri* from Ganz. on *Nux* 23 and the *Thesaurus*, s. v. ‘*formosus*.’

⁷⁹ In spite of its somewhat promiscuous character and its lack of critical sifting, Belling’s collection contains much that is valuable and that is not to be found elsewhere.

nothing can be more striking than the fact that while the first two books of Tibullus⁸⁰ show only occasional reminiscences of Propertius, the fourth book, on the contrary, is thickly crowded with Propertian echoes and thoughts.⁸¹

ROBERT S. RADFORD.

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE.

(Part III will follow in a later issue.)

⁸⁰ With the exception of II 3, cf. Belling, pp. 366 f., and of II 5, cf. Belling, pp. 374 f., and Postgate, *Selections*, p. 123.

⁸¹ The whole elegy IV 4—upon the theme of Sulpicia's illness—stands in the closest dependence upon Prop. II 28; see Olsen 30, Bürger 334, Belling 310, and especially Cartault, *Tibulle* 107; for a summary statement of the very numerous imitations both of Propertius and of Tibullus in IV 13, see Postgate, *Class. Review* IX 77.

It is remarkable that Bürger (*De Ov. carm. amatoriorum inventione et arte*, Wolfenbüttel 1901, pp. 79-84) has shown conclusively and at length that the distinctive 'Ovidian rhetorical art,' with its manifold divisions and its vivid and dramatic descriptions (*ecphrases*) of a state or condition, and also with the characteristic and favorite Ovidian use of *deceit*, *decor*, *decenter*, is fully present (as he notes) in the verses, 'Ps. Tib. IV 2, 5-14.'

III.—NE AND NON.

A clause depending on *facere* or one of its compounds, or on a verb of like meaning, may have the negative either of the volitive (*ne, neve*) or of the consecutive (*non, neque, nemo* etc.) clause. The comparative frequency of the two forms of negative seems not to have been determined; my collection of examples is, I hope, nearly complete for classical prose, to which however it is not confined. The four (late) instances under *cogere* are taken from the Thesaurus. Examples of *ne . . . quidem* are excluded, inasmuch as this combination is used with all moods and has no variant with *non*; those of *non modo (solum, tantum)* are included (though this combination also is invariable and used in all forms of expression), because no such distinction is made for *non* as is recognized between the simple *ne* and *ne* in *ne . . . quidem*. The following passages are not listed: Cic. Off. 3. 19 and Sen. Cont. 1. 2. 14 on the ground, perhaps not well taken, that *non* belongs to the infinitive; Liv. 45. 23. 4, where the reading seems to be doubtful; Cic. de Or. 1. 132, where *ut ne dedeceat* seems to be, like *modice* and *scienter*, an adverbial modifier of the clause *ut . . . utantur*. I have included such Plautine cases as Most. 389, which corresponds in sense, though not exactly in form, to ib. 423. The *ne* combinations are indicated by A, the others by B; the figures in parenthesis give the number of examples under each head; a *bis* after a quotation shows repetition of both governing verb and dependent clause, not of the latter alone; the form of the governing verb is not noted, except that *fieri* (including *factum esse*) is separated from *facere*.

- | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>adipisci</i> | A: Cic. Mil. 34, Dig. 8. 2. 4 (2) |
| <i>adsequi</i> | A: Cic. V. 6. 51, Off. 1. 28, Curt. 4, 14, 4, Justin. 2. 4. 27 (4) |
| | B: Cic. de Or. 1. 136, ib. 155, Plin. Ep. 7. 19. 8, Quintil. 10. 1. 10 (4) |
| <i>consequi</i> | A: Rh. ad Her. 3. 1, Cic. Clu. 51, Fam. 1. 2. 4, 1. 9. 26, Varr. R. R. 2. pr. 2, Sen. Cont. 1. 7. 8, Sen. D. 4. 12. 4, B. 6. 9. 2, Ep. 17. 3, Quintil. 9. 2. 62, Frontin. Strat. 2. 3. 23. (11) |

- B: Cic. Ph. 13. 31, Fam. 5. 21. 4, 12. 14. 2, Vell. 2. 124. 4, Sen. Cont. 1. 2. 14, Colum. 6. 2, p. 246, ed. Bip., Quintil. 10. 1. 112, Plin. Ep. 10. 61. 2, 10. 70. 1 (9)
- cogere* A: Dig. 39. 3. 2. 5, Amm. 24. 2. 5 (2)
B: Porphy. Hor. S. 2. 7. 72, Aug. Quaest. Hept. 1. 25, p. 13, 25 (2)
- compellere* A: Dig. 1. 7. 31 (1)
- perpellere* A: Sall. C. 26. 4, Liv. 25. 18. 11, Curt. 4. 1. 32, Tac. A. 11. 36 (4)
- pervincere* A: Liv. 10. 24. 9 (1)
- vincere* A: Pl. Mil. 187., ib. 568 (2)
- praestare* A: Cic. Prov. Cons. 39, Fam. 8. 10. 5, 11. 9. 1, 12. 13. 4, Att. 14. 16. 4, Liv. 30. 30. 30, 38. 49. 7, Ov. Her. 18. 89, F. 1. 288, P. 1. 7. 38, 3. 1. 65, ib. 115, Sen. Cont. 1. 5. 5 *bis*, Curt. 5. 5. 22, Sen. D. 5. 5. 3, 7. 1. 3, 8. 4. 2, 9. 11. 6, B. 5. 3. 2, Ep. 105. 2, Plin. N. H. praef. 33, Quintil. 5. 10. 82, 8. 6. 5, Gell. 11. 11. 3, Ps.-Quintil. Decl. 4. 2, ib. 19, 10. 17 (28)
B: Sen. Cont. 1. 5. 5, 9. 3. 13, Sen. Ep. 13. 6, 29. 12, 84. 6, Quintil. 10. 3. 29, Ps.-Quintil. Decl. 8. 9 (7)
- proficere* A: Sen. D. 5. 15. 2, Mart. 5. 76. 1 (2)
B: Cic. Att. 10. 4. 10 (1)
- conficere* B: Cic. Inv. 2. 145 (1)
- perficere* A: Cic. V. 3. 169, Leg. Agr. 2. 62, Mur. 17, Dom. 9, Sest. 3, Prov. Cons. 12, Fam. 1. 7. 8, ib. 10, 4. 13. 1, 5. 17. 5, 10. 12. 5 (11)
B: Cic. Inv. 1. 52, de Or. 1. 260, R. A. 147, Caecil. 39, V. 1. 32, 3. 113, Catil. 2. 28, in Sen. 26, Sest. 89, Ph. 12. 21, Ac. 2. 114, Rep. 5. 6, Fam. 12. 30. 1, Pet. Cons. 57, Att. 8. 11. 8, Val. M. 6. 2. 1, Veg. Mil. 4. 3 (17)
- efficere* A: Cic. de Or. 3. 190, Orat. 60, Part. 117, Clu. 83, Ph. 11, 23, 14. 14, Fin. 2. 24, 4. 10, de Div. 2. 78, Rep. 1. 38, ib. 67, Fam. 11. 28. 7, 12. 12. 3, 15. 12. 2, Att. 6. 1. 16, 11. 2. 3, Verg. B. 3. 51, Tibull. 3. 10 (4. 4). 5, Liv. 5. 19. 4, 5.

32. 4, 6. 28. 9, 8. 7. 6, 10. 9. 12, 23. 14. 11,
 34. 17. 8, 43. 10. 6, Ov. Her. 18. 99, A. A. 2.
 311, Tr. 1. 8. 49, P. 1. 3. 45, 4. 12. 41, Vitruv.
 7. 5. 7, Sen. Suas. 2. 2. 22, Cont. 2. 1. 20,
 2. 4. 7, ib. 13, 9. 5. 17, Vell. 2. 34, 3, Val. M.
 1. 7. 1, 3. 2. pr., ib. 18, 3. 4. 2, 5. 4. 3, 5. 6. ext.
 1, 8. 14. 3, 9. 11. 6, Sen. D. 4. 31. 8, 6. 13. 1,
 9. 8. 4, 9. 16. 4, B. 6. 2. 2, ib. 3, 6. 4. 2, ib. 4,
 6. 9. 2, 6. 33. 2, Ep. 88. 7, 92. 15, 94. 71 *bis*,
 Quintil. 3. 6. 102, 8. 3. 20, Frontin. Strat. 1. 8.
 2, 2. 5. 31, Tac. Agr. 6, Plin. Ep. 1. 5. 8, Pan.
 40, ib. 83, Justin. 5. 4. 4, Gai. 3. 73, Dig. 2. 14.
 27. 3, 2. 14. 61, 2. 15. 8 pr., 3. 3. 78. pr., 4. 4.
 38. pr., 4. 6. 24, 44. 7. 16, 45. 1. 38. pr., Ps.-
 Quint. Decl. 10. 13, 17. 14, 18. 13 (81)

B: Cic. de Or. 3. 193, Ac. 2. 50, Fin. 2. 15, ib.
 24, 5. 46, Tusc. 1. 16, de Div. 2. 147, Fat. 40,
 C. M. 42, Off. 1. 102, 2. 15, Legg. 1. 5, ib. 34,
 Att. 3. 7. 2, 7. 1. 2, Nep. 18. 9. 2, 25. 5. 4,
 Liv. 4. 60. 1, 26. 2. 10, 33. 21. 2, 37. 10. 6,
 Ov. P. 3. 3. 63, Sen. Cont. 2. 2. 1, 2. 4. 9, 9. 1.
 7, 9. 2. 18, 10. 4. 1, Vitruv. 2. 3. 2, 9. 1. 7,
 Val. M. 6. 4. 4, Cels. 5. 26. 21, Sen. D. 6. 20. 2
bis, B. 2. 7. 2, 4. 18. 4, 7. 20. 1, Ep. 5. 3, 48.
 11, 49. 10, Plin. N. H. 2. 27, 29. 21, Quintil.
 2. 17. 38, 7. 2. 28, 10. 7. 29 *e cj.*, Tac. H. 3. 52,
 Plin. Ep. 3. 16. 11, 7. 25. 5, Pan. 27, Dig. 47.
 2. 64. (49)

facere

A: Pl. Aul. 587, Mil. 149, Most. 389, 423, 1145,
 Poen. 909, Ter. Hec. 839, Cic. V. 1. 25, 4. 81,
 Clu. 16, ib. 168, Balb. 32, Off. 3. 6, Fam. 16.
 11. 1, Lucr. 2. 289, 4. 931, Liv. 2. 45. 12, 6.
 35. 9, 24. 9. 10, 25. 38. 14, 34. 14. 3, 37. 11. 4,
 Prop. 3. 16 (4. 15). 25, Ov. Her. 13. 96, A. A.
 1. 366, 2. 678, Met. 12. 282, 14. 353, P. 1. 1.
 65, ib. 66, Sen. Cont. 2. 5. 6, Exc. Cont. 3. 5,
 Val. M. 3. 7. 10, Sen. N. Q. 7. 30. 1, Plin.
 N. H. 37. 164, Quintil. 6. 3. 64, Dig. 43. 16. 1.
 28, Capitol. Ant. P. 2. 6, Macrobi. 1. 17. 15, Ps.-
 Quintil. Decl. 2. 1, 19. 14 *bis* (42)

- fieri*
- B: Pl. Capt. prol. 65, Pers. 73 *e cj.*, Poen. 489, Truc. 348, Ter. And. prol. 17, Rh. ad. Her. 2. 27, 4. 20, Cic. de Or. 1. 103, R. A. 68, V. 2. 2, ib. 22, Leg. Agr. 2. 7, in Sen. 12, Mil. 95, Lig. 1, Fin. 2. 15, Tusc. 1. 112, Off. 1. 110, Fam. 1. 10, 2. 6. 1, 5. 4. 1, 7. 14. 1, Att. 2. 20. 1, 7. 2. 8, 8. 14. 1, 11. 21. 1, Ov. Tr. 1. 10. 49, P. 1. 2. 97, Plin. N. H. 2. 27, Colum. 8. 17, p. 361, Sen. D. 1. 2. 4, N. Q. 3. 26. 7, Quintil. 4. pr. 4, Gell. 9. 4. 14, Ps.-Quintil. Decl. 16. 11. (35)
- A: Ter. And. 699, Caes. B. C. 1. 19. 5, 3. 37. 3, Cic. V. 6. 5, Fam. 4. 4. 1, Cels. 3. 17, 4. 32 (25), 6. 7. 8, Plin. N. H. 2. 33, Quintil. Decl. 343, p. 323 ed. Bip, Dig. 1. 2. 2. 16, 2. 10. 3. 4, 43. 24. 5. 2 (13)
- B: Lucr. 1. 982, 2. 395, ib. 835, 4. 818, 5. 265, 6. 116, Rh. ad. Her. 4. 28, Cic. de Or. 2. 285 *bis*, Brut. 291, Orat. 17, V. 3. 190, 6. 48, Dom. 64, Ph. 2. 1, 4. 2, Ac. 2. 36, ib. 83, ib. 107, Fin. 1. 27, 3. 53, 4. 30, Tusc. 1. 6, 2. 16, N. D. 1. 5, ib. 12, ib. 37, ib. 88, ib. 101, ib. 121, de Div. 1. 10, ib. 129, Lael. 76, Off. 1. 64, Q. fr. 1. 1. 2, 2. 8. 1, Att. 7. 7. 5, 16. 2. 2, Nep. 1. 2. 3, 15. 8. 1, Varr. R. R. 1. 2. 19, 1. 7. 6, Ov. Tr. 5. 13. 15, Cels. 4. 5 (2), 4. 26 (19), 7. 7. 8, 7. 27, 8. 4 fin., 8. 13, Sen. D. 3. 14. 1, B. 7. 3. 3, N. Q. 6. 16. 3, Ep. 29. 2, Quintil. Inst. 1. 1. 14, 3. 3. 14, Decl. 259, p. 54, 296, p. 159, 301, p. 175, 305, p. 183, Plin. Ep. 1. 1. 2, 6. 23. 1, Pan. 20, Justin. 16. 5. 17, Dig. 7. 2. 11 (64)

The variation between the A and B forms does not perfectly correspond to that between volitive and consecutive. Under B we have to take into account litotes (Capt. prol. 65, Ov. P. 3. 3. 63, Tac. H. 3. 52), a like negative after verbs of intention (cp. Val. M. 6. 4. 4 with de Or. 3. 74, Catil. 2. 28 with Off. 2. 85), and passages where, though *ut non* suggests only result, the context shows that the result was designed (de Or. 1. 260, Fam. 12. 14. 2, Sen. Cont. 1. 2. 14). And *ne* may be used in clauses expressing not only a designed result (V. 6. 52, Sest. 3, Orat.

60, B. C. 3. 37. 3), but also one that was not designed. The examples of this fall under three heads: (a) where the result is not had in view by the person who is the subject of the main verb, but is an incidental result of his action; (b) where the result is contrary to his intention; (c) where the subject is a *nomen rei* in no way connoting personal volition, or an equivalent phrase.

(a) Probably Varr. R. R. 2. pr. 2; certainly Liv. 10. 9. 12 *id ne pro certo ponerem vetustior annalium auctor Piso effecit*, Val. M. 3. 7. 10, Sen. B. 6. 9. 2 *ne in piratarum manus pervenirent quidam naufragio consecuti sunt* (the context shows that he is thinking of accidental, not voluntary, shipwreck), *id*. D. 6. 13. 1, probably also 8. 4. 2, Sen. Cont. 4. 7 *adulterium vocas quo effectum est ne quis timeat adulterium* (the speaker, caught in adultery with the tyrant's wife, had in self-defense slain the tyrant), Ulp. Dig. 44. 7. 16 *servus hereditarius . . . precario dando efficit ne res usucapi possit* (a legal consequence).

(b) Sen. Cont. 9. 5. 17 *dum non est contentus unam rem semel bene dicere efficit ne bene dixerit*, Sen. D. 9. 16. 4 *neminem flebo . . . flentem . . . suis lacrimis effecit ne ullis dignus sit*, *id*. B. 6. 4. 4 *colonum suum non tenet quamvis tabellis manentibus qui segetem eius proculcavit . . . non quia recepit quod pepigerat sed quia ne reciperet effecit*, Ps. Quintil. 19. 14 *tu facis ne possis negare quod dixerō*.

(c) Liv. 24. 9. 10 *tempus ac necessitas belli . . . faciebant ne quis . . . exquireret*, 37. 11. 4, Ov. Met. 12. 282, 14. 353, Plin. N. H. 37. 164, Plin. Pan. 83, Ps. Quintil. 17. 14 *explicuit nos sine dubio de criminibus exitus quod absolutus sum; tamen non hoc efficit ne mori velim*.

This neglect of the volitive idea usually associated with *ne* is found also in clauses dependent on verbs of hindering, which indeed never admit *ut non*: Cic. Fat. 1 *casus quidam ne facerem impedit*, Liv. 6. 31. 2 *ne rem agerent bello impediti sunt*, 6. 34. 5, 8. 10. 10, 10. 24. 2, 23. 4. 7, 38. 32. 1, Phaedr. 2. Epil. 5 *quoniam occuparat alter ne primus forem*, Colum. 7. 10, p. 314, *si locorum situs repugnat ne ita fieri possit*, Sen. B. 6. 9. 2 *quosdam ne ad ruinam domus suae occurrerent inimicus vadium tenuit*.

In contrast with the other verbs listed above *fieri* exhibits a

great preponderance of the consecutive negative. This is no doubt due to the fact that it often denotes not effectuation, but mere happening, or being, so especially in the combination *feri potest*. But in early Latin the equivalent of this combination, the simple *potis* or *potest*, may be followed by *ne*. It is possible to regard the examples of *potin (ut) ne* cited by Brix on Mil. 149 as volitive. Professor Elmer's explanation, AJP. XV 308, that they arise from fusion, I regard as unacceptable, because one of the forms of expression which his theory postulates seems not to occur. But it is true that they may be described as jussive questions; that Cist. 465, *potin ut mihi molestus ne sis*, expresses the same thought as Most. 74, *molestus ne sis*, just as Pers. 175, *potin ut taceas*, is equivalent to *tace*. Professor Elmer held that "the choice of *ne* instead of *non* is determined by the feeling of the speaker without regard to the grammatical form in which the sentence is cast"; I should be more inclined to admit this if he had succeeded in finding a plausible reason for assuming a volitive sense in Ps. 632 *potest ut alii ita arbitrentur et ego ne credam tibi*. This seems to me as clearly consecutive as the following cases with *feri*: Cels. 3. 17 *saepe fit ne febris accedat*; id. 6. 7. 8 *aliud vitii genus est ubi aures intra se ipsas sonant; atque hoc quoque fit ne externum sonum accipiant*; Sen. Exc. Cont. 10. 4 *init. factum est ne liberos patres . . . agnoscant*. Here *feri* = *accidere*; in Plin. N. H. 2. 33, *ita fieri ne convolutus aer torpeat*, we may paraphrase it by *effici*; if Pliny was thinking of nature's agency, the clause expresses a designed result, if not, pure result. After other verbs of happening a purely consecutive clause may have *ne*. Of course we cannot quote for this Cic. de Div. 2. 21 where *procuracione* introduces the notion of design, or Fam. 2. 19. 1, where the interposed *vereor* causes the clause to be treated as if it depended not on *caderet*, but on *verebar*. Also we may exclude Poen. 126, Mil. 725 f., and Fam. 1. 9. 26 (with which contrast *ut non* in de Or. 3. 145), on the ground that the negative is due to the influence of the verb of wishing, although it is not on this that the *ne* clause directly depends. But the following seem to me certain cases: Liv. 1. 46. 5 *forte ita inciderat ne duo violenta ingenia matrimonio iungerentur*, Cels. 4. 8 *accessit id quoque ne nisi recta cervice spiritus trahatur*, Val.

M. 7. 4. 4 quo evenit ne . . . prius sciret, Frontin. Strat. praef. continget ne de eventu trepidet, Quintil. Decl. 294. p. 155 sibi putat aliquis tam facile posse contingere ne reus fiat, Sen. Ep. 76. 19 unum est bonum virtus cui iam accidere ne sit bonum non potest, Procul. Dig. 18. 1. 68. 2 multis modis accidere poterit ne tradere possit, Pompon. Dig. 26. 7. 61 si quid ne in rerum natura esset per furorem eius accidisset, Val. M. 1. 1. 8 futurum . . . ne dinosceretur, 6. 4. 3 fore ne amplius . . . quereretur, Ulp. Dig. 20. 6. 4 pr. an desinat Servianae locus esse? et magis est ne desinat, id. 43. 24. 1. 3 est quaesitum an . . . exceptionem possit obicere . . . et magis est ne possit (but id. 26. 2. 16. 3 and Paul. Dig. 4. 8. 32. 8 magis est ut non). The explanation that the verb of happening has the force of a verb of effecting (Weissenborn on Liv. 1. c., Kuehner II 815) seems unnecessary for any of these passages and is certainly not admissible for all; quite impossible is the casual suggestion of Nipperdey, on Tac. A. 14. 7, that "*ne* bezeichnet die Bestimmung des Schicksals."

Professor Hale, Lat. Gr. 502, 3, c, commenting on the use of dependent volitive clauses "with adjectives, and verbs or phrases of adjective force," remarks that "with most of them the volitive feeling has faded out." Of words given in his list I find *ne* with *interest* in Sen. Cont. 4. 2, Tac. H. 1. 30, Ps.-Quint. 9. 18, and with *sufficit* in Plin. Ep. 9. 33. 11, all cases in which the original volitive notion seems not altogether lost; with *necesse est* in Sen. Ep. 4. 3, where it is lacking as entirely as in Cic. de Or. 1. 19 *necesse est aut nulla sit*, while quite vivid in Ov. Her. 16. 287 *aut faciem mutes aut sis non dura necesse est*, where *necesse est* might be dropped without affecting the sense. Perhaps the same "fading out" accounts for Pl. Aul. 434 *haud paenitet tua ne expetam*, and Ps.-Quintil. 7. 11 *contentus est eo ne de scelere quaeratur*; for Liv. 24. 27. 3 *plus in eo ne decipi posset . . . poneret*, with which contrast Sen. B. 4. 36. 2 *est rursus multum in eo ne indigno beneficium des*, and Colum. 12. 2. p. 475, *quoniam totum in eo sit ne contractentur pocula*, in both which passages the volitive sense is evident; for Ps.-Quintil. 2. 19 *haec est omnium natura rerum ne quid diutius proferas quam quod imitaris*, on the analogy of *natura comparatum est*, Liv. 35. 25. 7, 39. 29. 5, cp. Cic. Balb.

31 (but Cic. R. A. 102 more maiorum comparatum est ut . . . non dicerent, cp. Rh. ad Her. 4. 23, Cic. Dom. 77, Plin. Pan. 46); for Ps.-Quintil. 4. 15 haec sola fuit ratio mendacii ne praediceretur, cp. 16. 1, where a volitive *ne* follows after *ratio*; and for ib. 17. 16 tam consentaneum est ne moriatur qui velit quam quod moriuntur inviti, with which cp. *ne* after *congruit* in a clearly volitive clause, Dig. 17. 1. 10. 3. In the following the *ne* clause is appositive to the object of a verb on which such a volitive clause might directly depend, but the sense is that of result rather than design: Sen. Cont. 9. 5. 13 servavit hunc colorem ne . . . diceret, Liv. 30. 15. 5, Ps.-Quintil. 2. 12 hanc saltem praestabit dissimulationem ne teneat venenum, (contrast Dig. 8. 3. 20. pr.). In Cic. Inv. 2. 10 and Sen. Cont. 4. praef. 9. it would seem that we have examples of verbs taking the construction of their opposites, *amittere* like *consequi*, *morem gerere* like *praecipere*; the volitive sense is lost in the transference. The instances of *ne* with *merui*, Pl. Men. 1100, Vell. 2. 12. 5, Quintil. Decl. 294, p. 155, ib. 315, p. 223 (but 259, p. 55 *meruisse* qui non, cp. Inst. 10. 1. 74) show no volitive sense: as to origin these clauses cannot be separated from the subjunctive with *dignus*, regarding which grammarians disagree.

The (*ut*) *ne* clauses after a demonstrative adverb Brix, Mil. 149, and Reid, Sull. 27, call consecutive; Elmer, AJP. XV. 307, and Bennett, Tr. Am. Phil. Ass. XXXI 228, insist on the volitive sense—rightly, I think, for most instances. The governing clause usually expresses will or advice, occasionally habitual practice, as in Colum. 7. 8. p. 308 ita ordinatur ne alter alterum caseus contingat, but a single operation in Curt. 9. 5. 22 medici lignum sagittae corpori infixum ita ne spiculum moveretur absidunt, that is, "taking care not to disturb the head of the arrow." But in a very few passages the volitive sense is, I think, lost: Colum. 8. 8, p. 339, quae res avibus amorem loci sic conciliat ne umquam deserant, Tac. A. 14. 7 hactenus adito discrimine ne auctor dubitaretur; perhaps also Colum. 4. 29. p. 190, (tereбра) sic excavat truncum ne foramen inurat, and Liv. 26. 24. 16 Philippum satis implicatum bello finitimo ratus ne Italiam . . . posset respicere. True, Columella mentions the recent invention of the borer, and Laevinus intended to keep Philip away from Italy; but these facts are not set in any grammatical relation to the *ne* clauses.

There are a few other adverbial clauses with *ne* in which it is not easy to find the notion of design. Gray on Epid. 283 translates *ne gravetur* by "that he may assent to your wishes"; but the context requires a consecutive phrase in English. If the *ne* clause in Men. 429 followed *dicis*, it could be taken as continuing Erotion's suggestion by adding a reason for it; following on *ignorabitur*, it cannot easily be so understood. If, in Fam. 14. 1. 5 *cui si aliquid erit ne egeat*, the clause is treated as final, it would seem to be an instance of what I have not elsewhere noted, an expression of design dependent on an expression of mere existence. We can indeed say that *cui erit* = *habebit* and compare Pl. As. 319; but that may be taken, with Bennett, Synt. I 264 and 266, if not as "stipulative," at any rate as an originally paratactic volitive. It is less easy to prove such an origin for Cicero's *ne egeat*: if it be assumed, we must admit that the volitive sense has faded out. To paraphrase *efferarunt*, Liv. 5. 33. 11, by *efferando effecerunt* (Kuehner II 808, cp. Weissenborn ad l.) may help a young student over a difficulty; but I cannot believe that Livy so conceived it. In Liv. 33. 3. 9 *ne dubium esset quid exspectasset confestim Quinctius movet castra*, and 38. 58. 9 *ne magnitudo etc.*, there can be, from a logical point of view, no idea of design. Colum. 3. 10, p. 128 *ne sit incredibile*, Quintil. 1. 5. 61 *ne miremur*, and Plin. Ep. 1. 20. 8 *ne dubitare possimus*, must, I suppose, be explained as parenthetical final clauses, like Planc. 27 *ne tu . . . mirere*, quoted under that head in Nägelsb. Stil. 8th ed., p. 693; more natural to our feeling is the consecutive clause in Quintil. 7. 2. 5 *nam et substantia eius sub oculos venit ut non possit quaeri an sit*.

Against the use of *ne* where we expect (*ut*) *non* is to be set that of (*ut*) *non* where we expect *ne*. An early example is Trin. 133, cp. Blase-Landgraf, Hist. Gram. III 152. Professor Hale Lat. Gram. 513, 1, takes a different view and distinguishes, under the heading "subjunctive of obligation or propriety," this and other pre-Augustan instances from the later examples in which (ib. 464, 1, c.) he recognizes the association of *non* with the volitive. Corresponding to the question and answer in past time in Trin. 1. c., *non ego illi argentum redderem? non redderes*, we have those in present time in Ter. Hec. 341 f.

non visam . . . ? non visas: ne mittas quidem visendi causa quemquam. The explanation of Donatus seems to me the right one: et illam non vult ingredi et cavet ne ipse mittatur; but Bentley said "*Lege non visas?* interrogative," and later editors followed Bentley. His reason was, I suppose, the same as that which led Fleckeisen to prefer Priscian's *ne* to *non* of Donatus and the Terentian codices in And. 787, and Scaliger to substitute *ne* in Catull. 66. 91 for *non*, which Merrill retains as being "not infrequent in poetry and post-Augustan prose." That *non* with a volitive perfect was not confined to poetry is shown by Antony's use of it in Att. 14. 13. A. 3 non contempseris. True, Quintilian, 1. 5. 50, censures this combination, and Merrill's remark is, I believe, inexact; what is frequent in prose is *non* with volitive present; to this Quintilian (who has fourteen instances of it against nine of *ne*) had as little objection as Seneca. I do not include Quintilian's quotations of laws, which show *ne*; and the uniformity of legal language makes me doubt whether Gellius was citing verbally in 10. 15. 11. But I see no reason for not accepting (with Blase, in Landgr. Hist. Gram. III, 136) the *non* of Scipio in Gell. 4. 18. 3, and of Ter. And. 787. Cicero has *non* in Clu. 155 and Cael. 42; I do not add Fam. 9. 16. 7, where the text must be corrupt, because the sense required is that of Att. 14. 13 B. 4 iis opinionibus imbuas ut . . . arbitretur and Quintil. 1. 10. 15 in hac fuere sententia ut existimarent, and *consilium* means "intention," not "opinion." Under the same head of *non* with volitive I should, with Blase, put *utinam non*—in Cicero, Att. 11. 9. 3 with a following *ne*, Brut. 126, and without verb de Or. 2. 361.

In the Ciceronian period dependent volitive clauses also begin to take *non*, which should, according to Elmer, AJP. XV 320, citing Reisig-Haase ed. Schmalz-Landgraf p. 481, be read in Nep. 17. 4. 1. Whether in Cic. V. 6. 174 Zumpt's *non* or the *ne* given by both Kayser and Mueller has better manuscript authority, I do not know; but *non* seems not to be questioned as used by Cicero in Inv. 2. 19, Manil. 44, Ac. 2. 54, Tusc. 1. 17, Off. 2. 54, ib. 84, Att. 4. 1. 8, by Luceius in Fam. 5. 14. 3 and by Varro R. R. 1. 51. 1.

The grammars tell us that *non* is employed in volitive expressions when the negative emphasizes a particular word. To

apply this rule to cases where the verb has the negative, as Clu. 155, seems to me to push it too far; the verb is the clause; cp. Bennett, Critique, p. 20. It applies to cases of litotes as in Fam. 13. 26. 4 (but see Tibull. 1. 2. 15); to *non modo* etc.; to the sharp contrast of two clauses, as in Off. 2. 84 and Liv. 9. 11. 9, also Cael. 42, where the contrast to *non omnia* is only implied, while that to *non semper superet* is expressed. But down to Cicero's time *ne* could still be used for contrast or emphasis on a single word. Against Cael. 42 may be set Orat. 109 ut ne omnibus locis . . . non nunquam; in de Or. 2. 74 two prepositional phrases are contrasted by *non* . . . *sed*, in Inv. 2. 24 two infinitives by *ne* . . . *sed*; with Fam. 5. 14. 3 aut in altera mihi velim . . . obtemperes aut in altera non offendas, contrast Off. 2. 72 ita ut ea res prosit aut certe ne obsit. From Cato, as an example of the negative belonging to a single word, Kuehner cites Agr. 36 ablaqueato prius non alte; add 186. 7 aquam defundito non omnem; but 76 casei ovilli P. XIV ne acidum et bene recens in aquam indito, 80 unguito coloratoque caldum ne nimium. In a list of the points of cattle Varro writes R. R. 2. 5. 7, ut sint bene compositae . . . ne gibberae . . . pedibus non latis; in a similar description of horses 2. 7. 5, si caput habet non magnum nec membris confusis si est . . . naribus non angustis . . . genibus rutundis ne magnis. This *ne* after *est*, if Varro really wrote it, is remarkable; less so that after *debent esse*, 2. 9. 4. This use of *ne* does not, I believe, go beyond the Ciceronian age, except with comparatives, a very frequent combination, of which the most striking instances are those in which *ne* is attached to an appositional adjective; Cic. Legg. 2. 45 dicato . . . textile ne operosius, Colum. Arbor. 20 *init.* semina lege ne minus crassa, Liv. 32. 26. 18, Vitruv. 5. 5. 1, 7. 3. 1 asseres directi disponantur inter se ne plus spatium habentes pedes binos, 8. 6. 14. Usually the verb is imperative or subjunctive; but gerundive Varr. R. R. 1. 17. 3, infinitive with *noluit* Legg. 2. 66, with *vetat* ib. 68, with *oportet* Hygin. Limit. p. 111, 19 Lachm.

In his dissertation on "The Negatives of the Indo-European Languages" (Chicago, 1896) Professor F. H. Fowler came to the conclusion that the I. E. *ne* forms "had originally no specially prohibitive force," and, while remarking that "the form

nē became specially prohibitive only in Latin," pointed out that what he calls the "convictional value," that is, the use of *nē* in statements, "is retained in *nē* . . . *quidem*." In fact, this combination and the compounds *nequam*, *nequaquam*, *nequiquam*, to which also he calls attention, seem to prove that at some time in the pre-literary period *nē* was employed in all forms of expression; for it is difficult to understand how a primarily volitive association could have been disregarded only in these composites, and easy to see how they could, by virtue of their composite quality, have resisted the influence of the change which confined the simple *nē* to association with the volitive. As to the manner of this change Professor Fowler says: "In Italic and Celtic . . . the convictional negatives came to be used with volitive forms, and the old" (*me*) "form of prohibition died out. Further, in these languages one or another ablaut form was specialized and became with more or less consistency the special negative of volitive forms."

It seems to be permissible to go a little further in conjecture. It can be said with certainty that Latin in its earliest stage had the two forms *ne* and *nē*, and with equal certainty that in the developed language the former belongs to compounds, the latter chiefly to the volitive. Both are Indo-European; *non* is only Latin, that is, in its entirety, for of course, I. E. elements may constitute the word, which, while its origin is doubtful, is universally assumed to be a compound. As such, it would be, as Blase calls it, "verstärkte Negation," and from the time of its creation would tend to drive out the weak *ne*, except where the latter was saved by traditional attachment to a particular word, as in *neque*. And the somewhat stronger *nē*, while not so completely expelled from the sentence, would be displaced from the kinds of utterance which required (or were felt as requiring, for there is no absolute rule, cp. Lerch in *Die Neueren Sprachen*, XXXIX 24) most emphasis, such as the statement, the explanatory question, and the consecutive clause, which, in so far as it expresses actual result, is virtually a statement. A like expulsion of the weaker by a stronger negative appears in French; there indeed the number of strengthened negatives is greater, and the development proceeded on less regular lines than I assume for Latin.

There is no reason to suppose that, at the time when the Romans began to have a literature and in consequence a grammar, any rule was formulated to fix the negative particles in the positions already acquired; and it was quite natural that *non* should enter upon a second stage of progression, in which it encroached further on *nē* by penetrating the sphere to which it had previously confined that particle. The process might take place in different ways. Trin. 133 and Hec. 342 may exhibit, as Brix phrases it, an echo of the first *non* by the second: Cael. 42 and Off. 2. 84 show the increasing preference for *non* as emphatic negative. Such cases as Inv. 2. 19, Off. 2. 54, and Tusc. 1. 17 have probably no special ground, but merely illustrate the increasing inclination to employ this form of the negative. The fact that in the literary remains of the republican period *non* with volitive is still rare indicates the slowness of the development which culminated in Seneca's and Quintilian's free employment of it (at least with the independent volitive), but does not justify us in drawing a sharp line between the earlier and later language and in rejecting or explaining away for the former a usage which we must accept for the latter, and which is in itself quite natural and intelligible.

It seems to me highly improbable that (as suggested by Dr. Reid, see Pretor's note on Att. 2. 1. 3) the old free use of *ne* was carried over into, or revived in, the literary period. Its use in consecutive clauses can be otherwise explained.

With verbs of effecting it was probably due to mechanical extension. The *ne* clause here was originally a paratactic volitive. It is worthy of note that the Plautine examples cited under *facere* A always show a personal subject; and I believe it will be found that in Cicero verbs of effecting do not take *ne* unless they express or imply personal action (Fam. 4. 4. 1 may be an exception, unless *improbitate* can be regarded as importing the notion of design). But when the governing verb is in past time, as V. 2. 169, the expression of a result arising from design is clear. The result alone is perfectly clear in Liv. 2. 45. 12, *velle ne scirem ipsi fecerunt*, since we cannot say that the thought of the soldiers is exactly reproduced by the dependent clause; and such a departure from the original distinct reproduction of an original wish prepares the way for the further

extension in Liv. 10. 9. 12, where it is quite clear that the personal subject can have had no such intention, and finally for the use of the non-personal subject in 24. 9. 10. The fact that Cicero uses a non-personal subject with verbs of preventing, and that these do not take *ut non*, suggests that with them the extension may have taken place at an earlier period; but I have no collection of examples bearing on the matter.

With verbs of happening *ne* probably came in through unconscious reasoning. By the passing of the paratactic into a hypotactic volitive the adverb *ne* was turned into a conjunction: the substantival and adverbial volitive clauses were assimilated, partially in the positive form, where the former might take *ut*, wholly in the negative form, where either might have *ut ne* or simple *ne*. This process was complete before Plautus; the introduction of *ut non* into clauses dependent on verbs of effecting may be later, since the only Plautine example is Capt. 65, and that, even if the line is by Plautus, is a case of litotes. But at any rate by Cicero's time it was settled that with verbs of effecting either *ut ne*, *ne* or *ut non* might be used. For post-Ciceronian writers to assume that *ne* (*ut ne* was dying out) and *ut non* were equivalents was not unnatural; Livy's *inciderat ne* does not show a wider departure from the proper use of the conjunction than his *tempus faciebat ne*. It has not indeed the same support of association with a verb which regularly took *ne*; but Ps. 632 suggests that colloquial Latin had already arrived, without the help of this association, at treating *ut ne* and *ut non* as equivalents—had indeed reached the same point of view for the conjunction *ne*, if Epid. 283 and Men. 429 are to be taken as consecutive.

The employment of *efficere ne* by both Senecas to introduce a result contrary to the intention of the subject carries to an extreme a tendency that confuses the generally clear lines on which the use of the two negative particles had previously developed.

W. H. KIRK.

RUTGERS COLLEGE.

ADDENDUM.

I add some late gleanings, chiefly from the *Vocabularium Iurisprudentiae* of the Savigny Institute: *perficere* B, Cic. Leg.

Agr. 2. 50; *efficere* A, Suet. Iul. 17, Calig. 34, Dig. 8. 5. 9. pr., 19. 2. 35. pr., 40. 4. 61. pr., 45. 1. 41. 1., 47. 9. 10.; *efficere* B, Dig. 13. 5. 18. 1, 23. 4. 11, 35. 2. 78, 39. 4. 5. pr., 40. 5. 30, 45. 1. 56. 2, 47. 2. 64; *facere* A, Ov. R. A. 455, Serv. Aen. 11. 468; *feri* A, Ter. Ad. 626; *contingere ne*, Dig. 2. 14. 27. 2, 42. 5. 9. 3, cp. 14. 3. 11. 4 *contingit ne* proscriptum esset vel non pareret; *accidere ne*, Dig. 24. 3. 30. 1, 35. 2. 63. pr., 46. 3. 95. 11.¹

W. H. K.

¹ Mr. Nisbet's suggestive article, this volume 27-43, which carries speculation beyond the thesis of its title, did not come under my notice until mine was in the editor's hands. That we should differ on the interpretation of particular passages is the more inevitable as we differ in principle; his main clue seems to be psychology, while mine is mechanical transference. His English examples are interesting enough to arouse a wish for more; and, along with German *um zu*, French *pour* is worth considering. Is there really such a difference in manner of thought between Romans and moderns that they (p. 38) could consciously employ a final clause where we are sure that we have a consecutive? I incline rather to believe that the ambiguous clause which may be either final or consecutive is apt to be used by writers in any language without a clear consciousness of the distinction. But there are puzzling passages, and it is well not to dogmatize, though we naturally try, as Mr. Nisbet remarks, "to detain as many sheep as we can" within the hedge of our own theory.

W. H. K.

IV.—THE DATE OF PLATO'S LAWS.

August Boeckh (*In Platonis qui fertur Minoem*, etc., 1806, 73) was apparently the first to point out that in the *Laws* I 638 b καὶ καταδουλοῦνται Συρακόσιοι μὲν Λοκρούς, we have a reference to the seizure of the citadel of Locri by Dionysius II, and that therefore this passage must have been composed after that event. The date for this is now pretty generally given as 356 B. C. (Lutoslawski, *Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic*, 1897, 473; Hackforth, *Authorship of the Platonic Epistles*, 1913, 154; England, *The Laws of Plato*, 1921, *ad loc.* ["456" is only a misprint])—Christ-Schmid, *Griech. Literaturgeschichte*⁶ I 702, and von Wilamowitz, *Platon*, 1919, I 661, 1 are somewhat more cautious in their statement), but incorrectly, in my opinion. In 356 Dionysius II, although received at Locri hospitably,—his mother was from that place, and Syracuse and Locri had always been closely associated—seems at first to have spent a large part of his time in Rhegium, and did not seize the citadel at Locri and "enslave" that town until 352. This is clear from the express statement in Justin XXI 3, 9 that after *six years* of oppression the Locrians revolted, for it was while Dionysius II was away at Syracuse in 346 that the uprising took place (Strabo, VI 259; Justin, *loc. cit.*; Plutarch, *Timoleon* 13). This much had been noted before (for example by Plass, *Die Tyrannis*, II 255 f.; Holm, *Geschichte Siciliens*, II 191; Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, V 525 [Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, II 335, on the other hand, sees a contradiction where one does not actually occur]), but it has not, I believe, been observed how admirably this view is supported by the words of Demosthenes, XXIV 139, for here the orator, in a speech delivered in 353/2 (Blass, *Attische Beredsamkeit*, III 280) speaks in the present tense of Locri as a πόλις εὐνομουμένη, an expression quite impossible after the infamous act of Dionysius II.

In other words the tyranny of Dionysius II (or the "Syracusans," as Plato expresses it) at Locri did not begin until 352, and the composition of the above-mentioned passage in the *Laws* must be set not earlier than that year. Of course the *Laws* were not written all at one time (compare von Wilamo-

witz, *op. cit.*, II 258, 1) ; several works of Plato's old age were left unfinished, and hence must have been worked upon at intervals during the last few years of his life.

In conclusion it might be noticed that even if, as Mr. Hackforth (*op. cit.*, 153 f.) suggests, Dio's son Hipparinus is actually meant in the *Laws* IV 711 e,—and this is not impossible, although I should hardly regard it as very likely—still I see no reason for setting the composition of that passage precisely in 354 or 353. This Hipparinus was still alive certainly in 352, to which year the seventh epistle of Plato, in which he is mentioned (324 a), must be assigned, and almost certainly also in 351, for it is very probable that the eighth epistle was written in this year (compare Hackforth, *op. cit.*, 84 f., after Ed. Meyer; Hipparinus is mentioned here in 356 e and 357 c).

W. A. OLDFATHER.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

REPORTS.

NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR DAS KLASS. ALTERTUM, Vol. XXV
(1922), Heft 6-10.

Pp. 233-239. The number opens with a speaking likeness of H. Diels and a sympathetic obituary by I. Ilberg the editor. With Diels, who died after a brief illness on June 4, 1922, in his 75th year, there passed away one of the most consummate classical scholars of all times. It is not necessary to enumerate his splendid achievements from his epoch-making *Doxographi Graeci*, written at the age of 32, down to his *Lucretius* (Text, Commentary and Translation), a work to which he devoted nearly 40 years and which he happily completed shortly before his death. His scientific range was encyclopedic, and like Mommsen, whom he succeeded as Secretary of the Berlin Academy, he was also a great organizer of scientific undertakings, the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, the *Commentaries of Aristotle*, the *Corpus medicorum Graecorum*, to mention only three, owing no little to his energetic initiative and driving power. He was ever a kind friend of American scholarship and many young Americans were his pupils during more than a generation prior to the World War.

Pp. 239-253. H. Diels, *Himmels- und Höllenfahrten von Homer bis Dante*. This last product of his pen is one of the lectures delivered in Upsala, Göteborg, Lund and Copenhagen only a few weeks before his death and bears all the marks of his wide learning and synthetic power. Starting with the still prevalent beliefs of the Siberian Schamanians and the *καταβάσεις* of the Babylonian goddess Ištar and the Finnish *Wäinämöinen*, Diels passes in review the descents into the lower world of Odysseus, Herakles, Theseus, Orpheus, Pythagoras, the *καθαρμοί* of Empedokles, the apocalyptic visions of Epimenides and Parmenides. He then discusses the various conceptions of an Elysium as presented especially in Pindar, Euripides, the Orphic and Eleusinian mysteries. The lower world as the abode of malefactors who there receive their deserved punishment as contrasted with Elysian fields and the islands of the blessed were familiar ideas in the 5th century as evidenced by the old comedy and the paintings of Polygnotos at Delphi. The most exhaustive and most poetical description of underworld scenes is found in Plato (*Phaidros*, *Phaidon*, *Rep.*). A curious story is related by the Peripatetic Klearchos concerning an Athenian Kleonymos who fell into a trance and on reawakening tells what he saw and experienced in the world of the dead. It is preserved in Proklos' commentary on Plato's *Republic*. Reverting briefly

to the satirists Timon of Phlius and Menippos of Gadara (who appears in Lucian), Diels takes up the two elaborate descriptions which though influenced by Plato were given their final form by the great Poseidonios and through him most profoundly, though indirectly, influenced all later writers down to Dante—the *Somnium Scipionis* of Cicero and Vergil's *Aeneid*, Bk. VI. The author thereupon discusses the contributions of the Orient to this subject in the Old Testament, in an Orphic ritual preserved on a papyrus, Philo Judaeus, St. Paul and Luke, the Paulinian Apocalypse, that of Peter "the most impressive monument of Christian visionary literature before Dante." He then passes on to the *Hamartigenia* of Prudentius, Orientius, Gregory the Great, the Venerable Bede, St. Boniface, Walafried Strabo, closing with Dante.

Pp. 254-278. K. Burdach, *Die Lehre des platonischen Timaios* (40^B) von der Kosmischen Stellung der Erde und die Bedeutung von *εἶλω*, *εἶλλω*, *εἰλέω* und *ἱλλω*. The two word groups are originally independent, but were subsequently confused. Plato shows no knowledge of the earth's rotation, as has hitherto been generally supposed, even Aristotle being misled, owing probably to his having the false form *ἱλλομένην* in his Platonic text. Burdach would translate the passage as follows: "Sich pressend und ballend um die Weltachse und dadurch der mitreissenden Rotation des Fixsternhimmels fest sich entgegensetzend."

Pp. 279-288. H. Wocke, *Der Ackermann aus Böhmen*. An aesthetic and linguistic study of this most important prose work of German humanism, written about 1400 at Saaz. It is a dialogue between a plowman and death.

Pp. 288-301. A. Nathansky, *Spitteler und die Antike*. The still living Swiss poet is imbued with the classical spirit. He loves the ancients, but they are to him merely so much plastic material which he utilizes at pleasure, without forfeiting his own originality or independence.

Pp. 302-306. Fr. Münzer, O. Seeck († June 29, 1921) and O. Hirschfeld († March 27, 1922). Appreciative obituaries of these two famous historians.

Pp. 307-308. A. Scheindler, *Die Theorie der Widersprüche in der höheren Homerkritik*. To show the futility of drawing conclusions adverse to the unity of the Homeric poems from contradictions, the writer adduces two palpable instances in kind from two contemporary novels, to wit, A. Stifter's *Nachsommer* and Enrica v. Handel-Mazzetti's *Stephana Schwertner*, both of which the authors themselves discovered subsequently.

Pp. 309-310. K. Hartmann, *Eskimos in der antiken Litera-*

tur? thinks that the Indi who according to Plin. H. N. II 170 (= Mela III 5, 45) on the authority of Nepos reached Germany were Eskimos whose ancient name 'Innu'it' was corrupted into Indi. They had come over from the northwestern shores of America. He further concludes, following R. Hennig in *Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* X (1920) 246, that these passages were known to Toscanelli and were by him communicated to Columbus. As I have elsewhere pointed out, it is far more likely that Columbus became acquainted through Toscanelli with the famous passages in Strabo II 6 and Sen. N. Q. I prol. 13 in which Poseidonios suggested the possibility of reaching India by way of the Atlantic.

Pp. 310-312. E. Edelmann, Kleist's *Amphitryon* und sein Verhältnis zu Molière. Although Kleist on his own admission took Molière for his model, as the French poet in his turn followed Plautus and Rotrou, the differences in purpose, idea and execution are yet so conspicuous that the comedy of Kleist can lay claim to genuine originality. His method resembled that of Shakespeare.

Section II, pp. 161-163. G. Mayer, Goethe's *Mailed* ("Wie herrlich leuchtet mir die Natur, etc.).

Pp. 164-180. H. Engert, *Wendepunkt, Abstieg und Katastrophe* in Schiller's *Jungfrau von Orleans*, Ein Beitrag zur Aesthetik des idealistischen Dramas. An elaborate and ingenious attempt to justify the alleged inconsistencies in the character of the heroine.

Heft. 8.

Pp. 313-335. A. Körte, *Griechische Verskunst*. Before entering upon a more or less detailed criticism of the *Griechische Verskunst* of Wilamowitz (pp. 642, Berlin 1921) K. draws attention to the phenomenal fecundity of this veteran scholar since 1914. Besides numerous patriotic addresses and valuable scientific papers, he published such voluminous works as his *Aeschylus*, *Die Ilias* und Homer, Plato [and most recently Pindar], not to mention the edition of the *Vitae Homeri et Hesiodi*, the concluding chapter on the Oedipus Coloneus in the elaborate and very able book (*Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles*) of his son, who fell in the war, and a sketch of the History of Philology.

The systematic study of Greek versification in all its manifold forms begins with Gottfried Hermann. It passed through many vicissitudes and gave rise to acrid controversies. The most prominent participants in the battle still raging with unabated vigor are Roszbach-Westphal, H. Weil, Blass, J. H. H. Schmidt, Otto Schröder and Wilamowitz. The latter's contributions extend over more than 40 years and naturally his views in so

intricate and difficult a subject suffered considerable changes—*dies diem docet!*—, but unfortunately, as K. points out, Wilamowitz has incorporated into his book some of his older treatises, theories abandoned by him now standing amicably side by side with his maturer, present-day convictions, a discrepancy which cannot but confuse a reader who is not himself a metrical expert and thoroughly conversant with the author's own progress. The book suffers from other defects, but, in spite of all its faults, the sovereign mastery of the gigantic subject, the many brilliant emendations, the vast amount of information furnished, will make this work a *κτῆμα ἐς αἰεί*, which no serious student of Greek versification can ever neglect with impunity.

Pp. 330-344. Fr. Drexel, *Altes und Neues vom Tropaeum Traiani*. A learned survey and impartial discussion of the chronological, historical and architectural problems connected with the famous monument of Adamklissi in the Dobrudscha. The controversy started with the contention of Furtwängler, that the trophy was erected in 28 B. C. by Licinius Crassus. According to the inscription, it belongs to the reign of Trajan in 109. This difficulty Furtwängler avoided by the hypothesis that the monument was without any inscription up to that time. Still another theory (Jänecke) suggested that the square stone tower in the middle was built, or restored, by Trajan, whereas the superimposed cylindrical structure belongs to the time of Constantine. Again, according to Cichorius, the remains of a square building, some 200 m. distant, containing the names of over 2000 fallen soldiers belong to the time of Domitian (87) and twenty years later, when Dacia was finally subdued, the Adamklissi monument was added by Trajan. These problems cannot be decided, unless new discoveries come to our aid. So much only is certain, that the early date assigned to the monument by Furtwängler is quite untenable.

Pp. 344-363. E. Castens, 'Wilhelm Meisters Theatralische Sendung.' An elaborate discussion of this fragment of the *Ur-Meister* in comparison with the final form given to the novel by Goethe.

Pp. 364-368. R. Hennig, *Das Eridanusrätsel*. The identification of this storied stream was a problem in antiquity. Many favored the Rhone, the majority the Po, but as early as Herodotus it was said to empty into the Northern Ocean. The entire question is intimately connected with the provenance of amber and the two ancient trade-routes from the North Sea. Their terminals, the mouths of the Rhone and the Po, were confused with the starting-point. Hennig makes out a fairly plausible case for the identification of the Eridanus with the Elbe in which case the amber island variously designated as Abalos, Abalcia, Balcia, Basilia, Glesaria, situated a day's journey from the main-

land, could be no other than Heligoland. There are some difficulties in the way of this hypothesis, particularly the names Abalcia, Balcia, which rather suggest the Baltic. Hennig's further suggestion, that the words of Tac. Germ. 41 regarding the Elbe, *flumen inclutum et notum olim, nunc tantum auditur*, refer to the Eridanus, is open to the most serious objections. As the author adds in a postscript, the equation Eridanus = Albis had been anticipated by Olshausen, *Zeitsch. f. Ethnologie* XXII (1890) 270, though only in a note and without giving any reasons for his belief.

Section II, pp. 201-224. A. Debrunner, *Sprachwissenschaft und Sprachrichtigkeit*, deals particularly with the conflict between scientific linguistics and actual usage. The illustrations are all taken from German.

Heft 9.

Pp. 369-375. C. Clemen, *Der religionsgeschichtliche Ertrag der Argonautensage*. The writer, partly in opposition to Robert in his new edition of Preller's *Griech. Mythologie* and Karl Meuli, *Odyssee und Argonautica*, Berlin 1921, endeavors to find, in a number of the episodes of the Argonautic expedition, remnants of ancient ritual, sun myths and vegetation demons, subsequently no longer understood in their original significance. He deals in particular with the origin of the Phrixos legend and the golden fleece, the lost shoe of Jason, the Phneus myth, the adventures of Amykos, the disappearance of Hylas, the battle with the Dolionians, and the story of the Lemnian women. Although essentially mythological, they yet possess a religious and folkloristic background.

Pp. 378-387. E. Stemplinger, *Antike Motive im deutschen Märchen*. A most interesting collection of parallels between a large number of Märchen culled from the Grimm collection and classical folklore.

Pp. 388-403. F. Neumann, *Scholastik und mittelhochdeutsche Literatur*. Chiefly a study of Freidank and his relation to the religious teaching of medieval scholasticism.

Pp. 404-409. Jos. Waldis, A review of the work in Mycenae of the British School of Archaeology at Athens.

Pp. 409-415. G. Raddatz, A review of *Homerische Poetik*, Vol. I, E. Drerup, *Das Homerproblem in der Gegenwart*, Vol. III, F. Stürmer, *Die Rhapsodien der Odyssee*. The method and results of the latter work, in particular, are rejected.

Heft 10.

Pp. 417-426. Ernst Kalinka, *Elektra und Antigone*. Both heroines, who have many characteristics in common, are unknown

to the older mythology, and the Homeric poems do not even mention their names. Although a number of tragedies deal with them, neither of them exerted the slightest influence upon the development of the story, for even without Electra Orestes was compelled to obey the behest of Apollo to revenge his father, and the curse-laden sons of Oedipus would have met their doom without Antigone. The question, therefore, arises, whether these tragic characters were a purely poetical invention or whether they are connected in some way or another with some older tradition. The author thereupon points out that Electra, etymologically the same as the word for amber, was originally a daughter of the sun-god, worshipped at Rhodes as Electryone or rather Alektrona, her real name, as evidenced by an inscription of Ialysos. Her original home was Argos, where a king Alektor once reigned. How the sun-goddess eventually became the sister of Orestes and how her subsequent rôle in the tragic story resulted from this, is interestingly shown by the author.

Antigone is the idealized representative of family honor. Originally Eteokles and Polyneikes were not the sons of Oedipus, and the Thebais (not later than 700) and the Oidipodeia did not know Antigone and Ismene as sisters. Antigone is a substitute (*ἀντί . . . ἐγένετο*) for the exposed Oedipus; Ismene a Theban nymph, daughter of the Boeotian river-god Asopus; and Ismenion, the name of a hill near Thebes, the seat of a far-famed oracle of the Ismenian Apollo. This led to the selection of Ismene as a sister of the Theban brothers and she thus became in point of time the sister of Antigone. In Aeschylos they do not yet take part in the plot, for the close of the Seven against Thebes from vs. 1005 is a later addition. The innovations of Sophocles are then discussed and the reasons for them enumerated. The sublime figure of Antigone is a creation of the tragedians.

Pp. 426-438. P. Corssen. *Das Verhältnis der Apostelgeschichte zum 3. Evangelium*. An elaborate demonstration that St. Luke, the author of both narratives, composed the Gospel at a later date and that the latter is an amplification of the non-canonic gospel of Marcion.

Pp. 439-452. Martin Ninck, *Hölderlins Dichterisches Erleben und sein Verhältnis zur Klassik*. An attempt to show that the poet was not a Romanticist in the usual acceptation of that term, but a classicist at heart, the German Pindar, an intellectualist as opposed to the lyrical expressionist. Classicism is to him heroic poetry, as exemplified in Homer, the Edda, the Nibelungen and the Beowulf, in Greek tragedy, Pindar, Shakespeare, Schiller and Beethoven.

Pp. 452-453. E. Bethe reviews favorably the third edition of P. Cauers *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*.

Pp. 453-455. K. Kunst reviews Johanna Schmitt's *Freiwilliger Opfertod bei Euripides. Ein Beitrag zu seiner dramatischen Technik* (Religionsgesch. Versuche XVII 2, Gies-sen, 1921). This peculiarly Euripidean device was, by the way, first duly emphasized and treated with his usual eloquence by J. A. Symonds, *Studies of the Greek Poets* II 29 ff., a work unknown to the authoress and reviewer and most undeservedly neglected, it would seem, by the present generation of phil-hellenic readers.

A. GUDEMAN.

MUNICH.

ROMANIA, Vol. XLVIII (1922), Nos 1 et 2.

E. Philipon. *L' A médial posttonique dans les langues ro-manes*. 31 pages. This article is based on a study of geograph-ical names in which pre-Romance forms have been preserved to the present, the field being limited to words with certain selected suffixes. The general result shows that each Romance language had its own method of treating these suffixes, Piedmontese and Rhodanian having a dual system.

P. Marchot. *Notes critiques sur les plus anciens textes fran-çais et provençaux*. 9 pages. I. *Lostanit dans les Serments*. II. *L'aube bilingue*. III. *Les deux derniers vers du Fragment d'Alexandre*. These investigations endeavor to clear up passages whose interpretation has baffled modern scholars, the second hav-ing had no less than ten explanations proposed for it by as many linguists.

Mario Roques. *Sur deux particularités métriques de la Vie de Saint Grégoire en ancien français*. 21 pages. This metrical investigation endeavors to determine the rules governing the use of monorhyme quatrains and the occurrence of groups of octo-syllabic couplets in the two oldest known versions of the *Vie de Saint Grégoire*. It is furthermore noted that one of these ver-sions was written for use with musical accompaniment, as was evidently the case for certain other French poems of the earliest period.

E. Hoepffner. *Date et composition des Jeux dramatiques de Chantilly*. 31 pages. The Chantilly manuscript no. 617 con-tains five dramatic compositions, which fall naturally into three groups when judged from the point of view of their versification. The evidence furnished thus, reinforced by other signs, points to the fact of their having been first written by a nun of the Convent of Huy, and then copied by a younger sister Kathon Bourlet, a novice in the same house from 1478 to 1484.

A. Jeanroy. *Boccace et Christine de Pisan: Le De claris mulieribus* principale source du Livre de la Cité des dames. 13 pages. Boccaccio, after hesitating for a long time as to the plan he should adopt, finally decided to write his well-known work on women in haphazard fashion. Christine de Pisan, on the other hand, formulated a logical plan, although she deviated largely from it in matters of detail, and indeed used her chief source in very free fashion.

Pierre Champion. *Remarques sur un recueil de poésies du milieu du XV^e siècle* (B. N. fr. 9223). 9 pages. This short article consists of criticism and comment on Gaston Raynaud's edition of the year 1889.

Mélanges. Paul Marchot, Lat. vulg. *Ruccinus "cheval de charge." J. Leite de Vasconcellos, *Apontamentos filológicos* (português). George L. Hamilton, *Les sources de Tiaudelet*.

Lucien Foulet, *Discussions de la valeur de la statistique en syntaxe descriptive*.

Adolphe Horning. *Notes étymologiques vosgiennes*. 46 pages. This lexicographical and etymological study treats of some eighty-six words, all but four of which are to be found in the *Vocabulaire complet du Patois de La Bresse* published by J. Hingre during the years 1902 to 1910. These Eastern dialects of French have remained comparatively unknown to Romance scholars, and it is the main purpose of this article to call attention to some of the many linguistic problems raised by their special forms.

P. Boissonnade. *Les personnages et les événements de l'histoire d'Allemagne, de France et d'Espagne dans l'œuvre de Marcabru (1129-1150); Essai sur la biographie du poète et la chronologie de ses poésies*. 36 pages. Very little is known of the biography of this early troubadour except such data as may be gained by a comparison of the poet's own allusions to contemporary events. A careful study of these leads us to place him somewhat earlier in the twelfth century than Romance scholars have hitherto been wont to do. Indeed it is evident that the political events of the time exerted very great influence in determining his career as a poet.

Edmond Faral. *Des vilains; ou, Des XXII manières de vilains*. 22 pages. The comic element found in this text results from the unexpected character of the classification made by the author, as well as from the nature of the usually satirical definitions given. The critical text here published is partly in prose and partly in verse, and it is based on the readings found in the two known manuscripts both of which are now preserved in the Bibliothèque nationale at Paris.

Mélanges. G. Bertoni, Nota sul dialetto di Fontan (Alp-mar.). Antoine Thomas, Corneille (et ses dérivés) au sans de "Diafragme" dans quelques parlers provinciaux (Normandie, Picardie, Suisse romande). Charles Bruneau, Ancien français Biche. E. Walberg, Capsea > prov. Caissa, etc. E. Walberg, L'article Empersonnage de Godefroy. H. Yvon, Les formes de l'interrogation.

Discussions. Ernest Langlois, Gaston Paris et l'auteur du Jeu de la feillée.

Chronique. Discovery of two small epic poems in Provençal relating to Roland and the war in Spain. They were copied in a register by M^e Rostan Bonet dating from the year 1398. Together these poems comprise nearly four thousand verses about equally distributed between the two. The manuscript belongs at present to M^e Pondicq, a notary at Apt, Department of Vaucluse (M. R.).

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

REVIEWS.

REJOINDER.

Many years ago when I told Dr. Swanton of an error in Algonquian grammar I had unwittingly made, he replied, "Never mind! You and Dr. Boas will be the only persons who will ever know it." That time has happily gone by, and for perhaps the first time in American linguistics a specialist in a given field may be criticised by another specialist in the same field. — It may be ungracious to reply to Professor Leonard Bloomfield's very kindly review (AJP. XLIII 276 ff.) of my "Owl Sacred Pack of the Fox Indians," but there are a few points in which the reviewer is in error.

First the question of *a* and *ʌ*. I think Professor Bloomfield is quite right in assuming that they are really fundamentally one, because *a* never occurs before *k*, *p*, *t*, *tc*, *s*, *c*, nor on the original penult, nor before medial *m*; but at the same time the two sounds are for the most part easily distinguished: the combination -*a'igä*- seems to vary according to speakers. Now if the sounds are really distinct phonetically, even if not etymologically, two symbols are in order.

The difficulty of knowing whether final -*ʌ*' has lost a final vowel or not is not as great as Professor Bloomfield thinks. The only ambiguity will arise when the next word begins with a sibilant. Thus -*ʌ*' *s*- may be (say) -*a'i* + *s*- or it may be -*ʌ* + *s*-.

The translation at 26.3 follows the meaning given by the native (Indian) author as mentioned on p. 9. As Professor Bloomfield says, Algonquian songs are desperate. I myself should have thought "horns" more probable than "ears" but followed Kiyana's interpretation.

The instrumental -w- with animate object can not be denied, and is not a part of the stem, even though very rare. The stems nā- (see) and awi- (dwell) in the compound wi^dtcawi- (dwell with) show this conclusively.

I now hasten to add that remaining criticisms are nearly all well taken, especially those on the instrumentals -' -'tō-, -'w- -' -; I had reached the same conclusions on these last as will be seen when some of my volumes (which have been held up for years) appear.

BUREAU OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY.

TRUMAN MICHELSON.

Mažvydas: Seniausieji lietuvių kalbos paminklai iki 1570 metams. Kaunas [Kovno] 1922, Švietimo Ministerijos leidinys. **Mosvid:** Die ältesten litauischen Sprachdenkmäler bis zum Jahre 1570. Indogermanische Bibliothek, 5. Abteilung, 2. Band. Herausgegeben von Dr. GEORG GERULLIS, A.O. Professor für baltische und slavische Sprachen an der Universität Leipzig. Heidelberg 1923, Carl Winter. xxxx + 592 S.

Martinus Mosvidius (ob. 1562), a Lithuanian by birth, was the translator, in 1547, of Luther's catechism, the first book printed in Lithuanian and the earliest text that has been preserved. This and many other works of which Mosvid was the author, translator, or editor GERULLIS photographically reproduces by the Manul process from the originals, all of which are unique. They include litanies and hymns, in many cases with musical notation, collects, forms of baptism, paraphrases, homilies, etc. In large part they are translations from the Lutheran German, and in general they represent a vain attempt to win over Great Lithuania to the Reformation.

GERULLIS's introduction, in Lithuanian and German respectively, is especially valuable and adds materially to our knowledge of Mosvid. Since 1853, when Schleicher associated the catechism of 1547 with the dialect spoken about Memel, it has been generally assumed that Mosvid was of Prussian-Lithuanian origin. GERULLIS claims that his speech was North Lithuanian, but offers a number of facts to indicate that he was a native of the grand duchy of Lithuania. Several texts which have hitherto been unascribed or incorrectly ascribed are assigned to Mosvid.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

HAROLD H. BENDER.

Sammlung vulgärlateinischer Texte, herausgegeben von W. Heraeus und H. Morf†. Heft 6. Auswahl aus den Werken des Gregor von Tours. Herausgegeben von H. Morf†. Heidelberg: Winter, 1922. Pp. viii, 67.

Here we have at last what has long been desired by students of Latin, French, history and comparative literature—a compact and scholarly selection from the fascinating treasure-house of the “Herodotus of the Middle Ages.” Gregory, Bishop of Tours, an older contemporary of Gregory the Great, was one of the world’s foremost story-tellers. So sharp are his observations, so keen his comments, so artless and yet artistic his anecdotes, that he constitutes a literary enigma; for he tells us time and again that he is a *rusticanus*, that he mixes genders and construes prepositions with the wrong cases, that he has no *artis ingenium*, *nec sermonum facundia*, that *simplicitas pura* is his ideal—yet all his writings are in the most elaborate, indeed almost consecutive, rhetorical cursus (which, by the way, no critic has ever pointed out or utilized); and the cleverest French writers of today, in appropriating the best of his stories, have found it impossible to improve on them.

MORF’s untimely death, in 1921, left these selections, and his excellent introduction, almost ready for the printer; Heraeus has completed the work. This text follows closely the ancient MSS, with all their Merovingian orthography (some of which, I am sure, would surprise Gregory himself); so it forms at once a *corpus vile* for the student of late Latin and Romance, and a constant exercise in text criticism. Hard enough at the best, it is unfortunately marred by frequent misprints. Gregory offers a fertile field to the emender; e. g., *suscitati* 51^o must be *sciscitati*; *relecta* 41²⁰, *relecta*. With the other volumes in the series, a seminar in Romance philology now has abundant introductory material.

The selections throw lurid light on the tyranny, feuds, superstition and pestilences of Merovingian days; but they reveal primitively fascinating human beings; and the stories have the master’s touch. For power and simplicity, it is hard to excel Gregory’s accounts of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus, the escape of Attalus (which Beeson is using in his *Mediaeval Latin Primer*, and Game and I in our *Second Latin*), or the quarrel between Berthegund and her mother. Whoever reads these 67 pages will have a more vivid idea of Frankish civilization than he would get from many a history; and he will understand why the missionary spirit so strongly moved Columbanus and Gall, Boniface and Willibrord, and the others of our ancestors who set out, in their day, to bring the corrupt and decadent Continent up to British standards.

NORTH HATLEY, QUEBEC.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

Auxilia ad res Italicas Medii Aevi exquirendas, in usum scholarum instructa et collecta. N. 2. LUIGI SCHIAPARELLI. Raccolta di Documenti Latini. I. Documenti Romani. Como. Ostinelli, 1923. Pp. xiv, 159. Foreign price, 30 francs.

Professor SCHIAPARELLI of Florence has followed up his "Scrittura Latina" (AJP. XLII 285) with a useful and interesting collection of typical Roman documents. They range from the ancient sales formulae for animals preserved in Varro, to a donation of Bishop Ansoald of Poitiers of 675 A. D. Among the texts are Pompeian "for rent" announcements; an African ordinance sanctioning a public market; bills of sale for slaves; leases of Transylvanian gold-mines; bail bonds and certificates of deposit; business letters; wills; imperial rescripts; "Gesta Municipalia"; and deeds of gift. These are largely of the late imperial period; in fact, this booklet is introductory, and forms the Roman approach to medieval Italian institutions, for which later numbers will provide the documents. Each item in this collection has a full bibliography, and there is a valuable Index Verborum. Misprints are infrequent, and great pains have been taken with the text. The selections are of wide interest; several of the later ones are written in the rhetorical cursus. Altogether this is a most handy little collection, which whets the appetite for the volumes yet to appear.

NORTH HATLEY, QUEBEC.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

St. Andrews University Publications. XIV. Palaeographia Latina. Part I. Edited by Professor W. M. LINDSAY. Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press: London and New York, 1922. Pp. 66; five plates. 5 shillings.

This ushers in what we hope will be a long series of treatises on Latin paleography, directed by the dean of British paleographers, W. M. LINDSAY; two parts are to appear each year. In this booklet, LINDSAY has drawn on his vast erudition and unrivalled annotations, and has given us an exhaustive and authoritative classification of the shapes of letters and ligatures in the pre-Caroline minuscule. Some of these ligatures, like & (et), are still in use; and to a practised eye, their varying forms, and those of the letters themselves, are an infallible indication of date and provenance. But it needs a respectable training in paleography to utilize them; indeed, no less a luminary than Wattenbach erred some 250 years in dating the Hersfeldensis of Ammianus, and that by using letter-forms too exclusively as

a criterion. In paleography, there is no royal road; and no one should presume to use these tabulations for critical purposes who has not spent many weary months over MSS or fac-similes. The trained student will admire on every page LINDSAY's acute observations (like those on early n, pp. 35-36) and ingenious descriptions. These are supplemented by five excellent plates; four, from Corbie MSS, illustrate LINDSAY's loving and faithful reproduction of the lost "Early Scripts of the Corbie Scriptorium," projected by the late Abbé Liebaert. Liebaert (whom we all hold in affectionate memory) had discussed this topic with LINDSAY in such detail, and has left such a wealth of photographs, that all will accept this brief essay as authoritative, and thank LINDSAY for it.

As with all LINDSAY's work, there is a wealth of incidental observation of value to every serious student of medieval history, as well as of text criticism. The book was printed in Italy, which explains the frequent misprints. The references seem to be thoroughly accurate. LINDSAY indicates many points which need further investigation, but in most cases his discussion is practically final. His statement on p. 21 about g in Spanish minuscule is a little too sweeping; the Continental form occurs occasionally; and perhaps fuller study of Visigothic and Merovingian script will modify a few of LINDSAY's dicta; but this volume is the work of a master.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

NORTH HATLEY, QUEBEC.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Abū 'L-Mahāsīn Ibn Taghrī Birdī's Annals, entitled An-Nujūm Az-Zahira Fī Mulūk Miṣr Wal-Kāhira. Edited by William Popper. (Univ. Cal. Publications in Semitic Philol., Vol. 6, No. 5, pp. 691-993, with Indices and Glossary. June, 1923.) Berkeley, *Univ. Cal. Press*.

Allen (James T.) Problems of the Proskenenion. (University of Cal. Publications in Class. Philology, Vol. 7, No. 5, pp. 197-207.) Berkeley, Cal., 1923.

Bell (Clair Hayden). The Sister's Son in the Medieval German Epic. A Study in the Survival of Matriliney. (Univ. Cal. Publications in Mod. Philol., Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 67-182.) Berkeley, *Univ. Cal. Press*, 1922.

Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies. Vol. I, Part III. November, 1922. University of Wales. London, *Oxford University Press*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*. Price, \$2.50.

Boulenger (Fernand). Essai critique sur la syntaxe de l'empereur Julien. 264 pp. 8°. 25 fr. Remarques critiques sur le texte de l'empereur Julien. 73 pp. 8°. 8 fr. Lille, *Facultés Catholiques*, 1922. (Mémoires et Travaux publiés par des professeurs des Facultés Catholiques de Lille. Fascicules XXII et XXIII.)

Claim of Antiquity. With an annotated list of books for those who know neither Latin nor Greek. Oxford, *University Press*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*. 30 pp. 12°. 35 cts.

Classical Quarterly. Vol. XVIII. No. 2. April, 1923. London, *John Murray*; New York, *G. E. Stechert & Co.*

Classical Studies. Series No. II. (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 15.) By Members of the Department of Classics. Madison, 1922.

Colbert (Sister Mary Columkille). The Syntax of the De Civitate Dei of St. Augustine. (Ph.D. diss.) Washington, *The Catholic University of America*, 1923. (The Catholic University of America, Patristic Studies, Vol. IV.)

De Saussure (Ferdinand). Cours de Linguistique générale. Publié par Charles Bally et Albert Sechehaye avec la collaboration de Albert Riedlinger. 2e édition. Paris, *Payot*, 1922. 332 pp. 8°. 12 fr.

D'Herbigny (Michel, S. J.) L'Unité dans le Christ. (Orientalia, Anno IV. Series II.—Christiana. Num. 1, Pascha, 1923.) Roma, *Pontificio Istituto Orientale*.

Estudios. Año II, No. 4. Panamá, Mayo y Junio, 1923.

Exler (Rev. Francis Xavier J., O. Praem.) The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter. A Study in Greek Epistolography. Doctoral Diss. Washington, D. C., *Catholic University of America*, 1923. 141 pp. 8°.

Fraser (John). History and Etymology. An Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on March 3, 1923. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1923; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*. 18 pp. 8°. 50 cts.

Gagnér (Anders). Zur römischen Zeitrechnung. (Strena Philologica Upsaliensis. Per Persson på hans 65-årsdag. Nyårsafton, 1922. Pp. 202-223.)

Geiger (Bernhard). Die Amōsa Spōntas. Ihr Wesen und ihre ursprüngliche Bedeutung. (Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien,

philos.-histor. Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 176. Band, 7. Abhandlung.) Wien, *Alfred Hölder*, 1916. 248 pp. 8°.

Hall (Clayton M.) *Nicolaus of Damascus' Life of Augustus. A Historical Commentary Embodying a Translation.* (Smith College Classical Studies, No. IV, May, 1923.) Northampton, Mass., 1923. (Johns Hopkins diss.)

Hespéris. *Archives berbères et Bulletin de l'Institut des Hautes-études marocaines.* Année 1922. 3^e et 4^e Trimestres. Paris, *Émile Larose*.

Hoc (Marcel). *Le Déclin de l'Humanisme Belge. Étude sur Jean-Gaspard Gevaerts (1593-1666).* Bruxelles, *Les Éditions Robert Sand*, 1922. 240 pp. 8°. 25 fr.

Italie (G.) *Euripidis Hypsipyla ed. cum notis criticis et exegeticis.* Leyden diss. Berolini, apud Aemilium Ebering, 1923. 80 pp. 8°.

Janell (Walther). *Lob des Schauspielers, oder Mime und Mimus.* Berlin, *Wir Verlag*, 1922. 146 pp. 12°.

Journal of Education and The School World. London, *William Rice*, May, June, July, 1923.

Karlgren (Bernhard). *Sound & Symbol in Chinese.* (Language & Literature Series, General Editor C. T. Onions.) London, *Oxford University Press* 1923; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*. 112 pp. 12°. Price, \$1.00.

Levy (Reuben). *Persian Literature. An Introduction.* (Language & Literature Series, General Editor C. T. Onions.) London, *Oxford University Press*, 1923; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*. 112 pp. 12°. \$1.00.

Limberger (Georg). *Die Nominalbildung bei Polybios.* Stuttgart, *W. Kohlhammer Verlag*, 1923. 106 pp. 8°.

Lundström (Vilh.) *Tacitus' poetiska källor.* Göteborg doctor's diss. Göteborg, *Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag*, 1923. 24 pp. 8°.

Machen (J. Gresham). *New Testament Greek for Beginners.* New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1923. xii + 285 pp. 12°.

Marouzeau (J.) *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine. I: Les groupes nominaux.* (Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris.—XII.) Paris, *Champion*, 1922. 236 pp. 8°. 30 fr.

Meillet (A.) *Les origines indo-européennes des mètres grecs.* Paris, *Les Presses Universitaires de France*, 1923. viii + 80 pp. 8°.

Merrill (William A.) *The Lucretian Hexameter, II.* (Un. of Cal. Publications in Class. Philol., Vol. 5, No. 13, pp. 297-334, May 7, 1923.) Berkeley, Cal., *Univ. of Cal. Press*.

Nutting (Herbert C.) *Subjunctive Conditions in Tacitus.* (Univ. of Cal. Publications in Class. Philol., Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 143-195.) *Univ. Cal. Press*, Berkeley, Cal., 1923.

Our Debt to Greece and Rome Series. Boston, *Marshall Jones Co.*, 1923. No. 10 A: *Cicero and His Influence.* By John C. Rolfe. ii + 178 pp. 12°. No. 30: *Roman Politics.* By Frank Frost Abbott. 177 pp. 12°. No. 33: *Warfare by Land and Sea.* By Eugene S. McCartney. xvi + 206 pp. 12°. No. 36: *Mathematics.* By David Eugene Smith. x + 175 pp. 12°.

Parsons (Sister Wilfrid). *A Study of the Vocabulary and Rhetoric of the Letters of Saint Augustine.* Diss. (Catholic University of America, Patristic Studies, Vol. III.) 280 pp. 8°. Washington, D. C., *Catholic Univ. of Am.*, 1923.

Peterson (Roy M.) The Cults of Campania. Rome, *American Academy*, 1919. vii + 403 pp. (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. I.)

Petronii Cena Trimalchionis nebst ausgewählten Pompejanischen Wandinschriften. 2. Aufl. Herausg. von W. Heraeus. (Sammlung vulgärlateinischer Texte herausg. von W. Heraeus u. H. Morf, 2. Heft.) Heidelberg, *Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung*, 1923. 25 cts.

Philological Quarterly, Vol. II, July, 1923, No. 3. Published at the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

Pollard (Alfred W.) The Foundations of Stakespeare's Text. The British Academy, Tercentenary of the First Folio, The Annual Shakespeare Lecture, April 23, 1923. London, *Oxford University Press*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*. Price, 35 cts.

Popper (William). Studies in Biblical Parallelism. Part III. Parallelism in Isaiah. (Un. of Cal. Publications in Semitic Philology. Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 445-551. April 7, 1923.) Berkeley, Cal., *Un. Cal. Press*.

Radin (Paul). The Winnebago Tribe. 37th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology (1915-16), pp. 33-560. Washington, *Smithsonian Institution*, 1923.

Reinsch (Frank H.) Goethe's Political Interests Prior to 1787. (University of Cal. Publications in Mod. Philol., Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 183-278.) Berkeley, Cal., *Univ. of Cal. Press*, 1923.

Sheppard (J. T.) The Pattern of the Iliad. London, *Methuen & Co.*, 1922. xi + 216 pp. 12°.

Sikes (E. E.) Roman Poetry. London, *Methuen*, 1923. 280 pp. 12°.

Smith (Logan P.) English Idioms. (S. P. E. Tract No. XIII. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1923; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*. Price, \$1.20.

Taylor (Archer). Northern Parallels to the Death of Pan. (Washington University Studies, Vol. X, Humanistic Series, No. 1, pp. 3-102. October, 1922.)

Vaccari (A., S. J.) "Libri interpolati" presso i Padri latini. (Gregorianum, a. IV (1923), vol. IV, pag. 106-116.) Roma, *Pontificia Università Gregoriana*.

Vassar Mediaeval Studies. By Members of the Faculty of Vassar College. Edited by Christabel Forsyth Fiske. New Haven, *Yale University Press*, 1923. xii + 492 pp. 8°. Price, \$5.00.

Walsh (William S.) The Conquest of Constipation. New York, *E. P. Dutton & Co.*, 1923. vii + 265 pp. 12°. Price, \$2.00.

Ward (Ida C.) Defects of Speech. Their Nature and Their Cure. New York, *E. P. Dutton & Co.*, 1923. viii + 70 pp. and Diagrams. Price, \$1.00.

Webster (E. W.) The Works of Aristotle Translated into English. Meteorologica. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1923; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*. Price, \$2.50.

Wright (Joseph and Elizabeth Mary). An Elementary Old English Grammar. New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1923. viii + 192 pp. 12°. \$2.00.